JACK POSOBIEC JOSHUA LISEC

UNHUMANS

THE SECRET HISTORY OF COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONS (AND HOW TO CRUSH THEM)

FOREWORD BY STEPHEN K. BANNON

UNHUMANS

UNHUMANS

THE SECRET HISTORY
OF COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONS
(AND HOW TO CRUSH THEM)

JACK POSOBIEC
JOSHUA LISEC

Foreword by Stephen K. Bannon

Skyhorse Publishing

Copyright © 2024 by Jack Posobiec and Joshua Lisec
Foreword copyright © 2024 by Stephen K. Bannon

All Rights Reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any manner without the express written consent of the publisher, except in the case of brief excerpts in critical reviews or articles. All inquiries should be addressed to Skyhorse Publishing, 307 West 36th Street, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10018.

War Room Books may be purchased in bulk at special discounts for sales promotion, corporate gifts, fund-raising, or educational purposes. Special editions can also be created to specifications. For details, contact the Special Sales Department, Skyhorse Publishing, 307 West 36th Street, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10018 or info@skyhorsepublishing.com.

War Room Books® is a registered trademark of WarRoom, LLC.

Skyhorse Publishing® is a registered trademark of Skyhorse Publishing, Inc.®, a Delaware corporation.

Visit our website at www.skyhorsepublishing.com.
Please follow our publisher Tony Lyons on Instagram @tonylyonsisuncertain

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available on file.

Cover design by David Ter-Avanesyan

Hardcover ISBN: 978-1-64821-085-3
eBook ISBN: 978-1-64821-086-0

Printed in the United States of America

This book is dedicated to the memory of those who have fought communism.

There live the tyrants who treat the people like beasts.

—Pyotr Wrangel, *Always with Honor*

CONTENTS

Foreword by Stephen K. Bannon
Introduction: Petty Resentment and Cruelty

CHAPTER 1: SO YOU THINK YOU KNOW COMMUNISM

CHAPTER 2: THE UNHUMANS ARE COMING
- How Did We Get Here?
- Feelings Don't Care about Facts

CHAPTER 3: SUN TZU RED: HOW COMMUNISTS WIN BEFORE FIGHTING
- The Pre-Revolution
- How Radicals Prepare Your Environment for Destruction
  - Dividing a Society, in Three Simple Steps
    - Communist OPE, Stage 1: The Separation
    - Communist OPE, Stage 2: The Message
    - Communist OPE, Stage 3: The Infiltration
- To Divide Is to Conquer

CHAPTER 4: THREE ACTS, THREE OUTCOMES: THE PLAN FOR REVOLUTION
- Three Acts to Power: The Arc Every Revolution Follows
  - The Revolution, Act I: Incite
  - The Revolution, Act II: Seize
  - The Revolution, Act III: Purge
    - Where from Here
- Fighting Back: The Three Ways to Crush a Communist Uprising
  - How to Defeat the Unhumans: Let Them Eat Themselves
  - How to Defeat the Unhumans: Find the Great Men of History
  - How to Defeat the Unhumans: Win before Fighting

CHAPTER 5: THE FRENCH TERROR: THE UNTOLD STORY OF THE COMMUNIST FRENCH REVOLUTION
- Before the Bastille
- Under Pressure, Under the Guillotine
- The Revolution Finally Eats Itself
- The Legacy of the Communist French Revolutions
- Dishonorable Mention: Communist Revolution in Haiti
- The Revolution Is Now

CHAPTER 6: BLOOD ON THE SNOW: THE UNTOLD STORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION
- The Road to St. Petersburg
- The Russian Civil War
- Dekulakization
- Ouroboros as Strategy
- The Last Stand of the Imperial Guard

CHAPTER 7: THE LAST CRUSADE: THE UNTOLD STORY OF THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR
- The Comintern Comes to Spain and So Does Hell Itself
- The Left Eats Itself (Again)
- Francisco Franco, a Great Man of History
- Fortress of Freedom

CHAPTER 8: THE UNHUMAN REPUBLIC OF CHINA: THE UNTOLD STORY OF MAO'S COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONS
- The Mandate of Communism
- World War China
- The American Response That Wasn't
- Chaos under Heaven
- The Great Leap Forward
- The Cultural Revolution

CHAPTER 9: NEW AMERICAN FOUNDING: THE UNTOLD STORY OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND CULTURAL MARXISM
- The Real Civil Rights Legacy
- What Happens on Campus Goes Everywhere
- Boom and Doom
- Civil Rights before the Civil Rights Movement
- They Fought "The Man," Then Became Him
- McCarthy Was Right

CHAPTER 10: RED-HOT COLD WAR: THE UNTOLD STORY OF SOVIET-SPONSORED REVOLUTIONARY WARS
- Unhumans: The First Globalists
- The Cuban Revolution (1953–1959)
- Marxist Chile (1970–1973)
- Cambodia's Killing Fields (1975–1979)
- A Long Red Night in Nicaragua (1978–1990)
- The Afghan-Soviet War (1979–1989)

CHAPTER 11: BLACK AND RED: THE UNTOLD STORY OF COMMUNISM IN AFRICA
- Rhodesia House Blues
- *"Kill the Boer"*: New Apartheid in South Africa

CHAPTER 12: INSURRECTION AND THE IRREGULAR REVOLUTION
- The Irregular Communist Revolution
- January 6, 2021: America's Inverse Bastille
- Microrevolutions
- The Iron Law of Exact Reciprocity

CHAPTER 13: THE PLAN: COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY STRATEGY AND TACTICS
- Three Ways to Crush the Revolution, Revisited
  - 1. The Ouroboros Option (The Snake Eats Itself)
  - 2. Great Men of Means
    - Great Deeds for Great Men and the Iron Law of Exact Reciprocity
  - 3. Victory before Battle
    - How Normal People Can Crush Communist Revolution 2.0
    - Counterrevolutionary OPE to Win
- We Are Going to Win

Notes
Acknowledgments
About the Authors
Index

FOREWORD

BY STEPHEN K. BANNON

An important and apocryphal story is often told about a secret meeting in Bejing in July 1971 between U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Zhou Enlai, a leading figure in the Chinese Communist Party who served as a diplomat and the first Premier of the People's Republic of China from 1954 until his death in 1976. He played a major role in the Chinese Revolution. As Kissinger recalled in his book, he asked Zhou Enlai what he thought about the success of the French Revolution. "Too soon to say," Enlai replied.

While the veracity of that particular story has been challenged, the message is clear … human history is not a sprint. It is a marathon, its success is frequently challenged, and its endurance is not guaranteed.

In *Unhumans*, the authors focus on the critical matter of what actually makes us human. They note that "humanity" only happens when you have an actual civilization—principles of civility, rules of law and order, respect for basic human rights. Great civilizations have always organzied and risen from these characteristics, from the ancient world to the Roman Empire to the West today.

The authors argue that it is humanity itself currently under threat. They unwrap the history of Communism, a dehumanizing philosophy of oppression, of denial of human rights and nihilism. The reader is guided around the world, revealing the stories and histories the mainstream press won't touch … from Cambodia, Nicaragua, Chile, Afghanistan and the Soviets, to Apartheid in South Africa. They bring us right up to President Donald Trump and January 6th, a day they correctly call "America's Inverse Bastille."

Jack Posobiec is a graduate of Temple University and a former Naval Intelligence Officer. He was deployed to Guantanamo Naval Base for ten months in 2012 and is fluent in Mandarin.

Joshua Lisec is a writer with over eighty books to his credit. Together, Jack and Joshua unwrap a dazzling yet dire history of Communism's impact on humanity across the globe. From the Russian Revolution to the true story of the Spanish Civil War, they describe and explain the 1950s emergence of Cultural Marxism in the United States, and its current resurgence.

"Unhumans" simply refers to those *Homo sapiens* who seek nothing but destruction of human society, borne of grievance and misery and nihilism. Unquestionably, we are in a period of this unhuman ascension.

Unhumans is a clarion call to every American citizen. Be aware. Too often, the most dire and significant moments in history are only realized afterward, when civilizations are already defeated or too broken to continue.

If you love this country, read this book. Study this book. Share this book. And understand

this: The very survival of the American Republic is now on the shoulders of every American.

INTRODUCTION

PETTY RESENTMENT AND CRUELTY

> *Communism is when ugly deformed freaks make it illegal to be normal then rob and/or kill all successful people out of petty resentment and cruelty. The ideology is all just window dressing.*
>
> —@MysteryGrove

This is not a book about communist ideology. You've read those. This is a book about the communist reality—and how to tell when it's coming to a society near you.

History does not repeat, but it rhymes. For as long as there have been beauty and truth, love and life, there have also been the ugly liars who hate and kill. This is the way of things in all things. There is light and there is dark. Always has been. Always will be. Civilization is the superstructure built on law and order that keeps the petty, the resentful, and the cruel away from the rest of us. Some societies have been better at this than others. Those who fail at repelling the repulsive fall to unhumanity—to a state of affairs in which human thriving is impossible and surviving improbable.

It doesn't matter what you call these the people of anti-civilization. They will change their name, shape, and form as needed and for their own purposes in their unique time and place. For the last couple centuries, we've known them as communists. Socialists, with extra steps. And of course, leftists. Radicals and revolutionaries as well. A hundred years ago, Marxist-Leninists, then more recently, Cultural Marxists. Even as, without irony and not as a joke, "progressives." For the purposes of this book, we will call them the *unhumans*. This is a book about unhumans, and this is what they do: With power, unhumans undo civilization itself. They undo order. They undo the basic bonds of society that make communities and nations possible. They destroy the human rights of life, liberty, and property—and undo their own humanity in the process by fully embracing nihilism, cynicism, and envy.

"Unhuman"—isn't that harsh? Yes, and it also happens to be correct. By becoming consumed by nihilism, unhumans oppose everything that makes up humanity. As they are opposed to humanity itself, they place themselves outside of the category completely, in an entirely new misery-driven subdivision, the unhuman. They specifically reject the human rights

of others. So if and when they get their way, they will unhuman you, too. They convert, and that which they cannot convert, they destroy. And they will call this evil, good.

But that's not how it starts. It all begins with a wedge between two identifiable groups in a given society—the haves, and the have-nots, which they prefer to call the oppressor and the oppressed, respectively. Now, many have-nots do aspire to more, and they earn every bit of it. But some of them stop dreaming. Some don't in the first place. And the trouble is, these men and women find each other. They have shared grievances, real and imagined. And then … they unite. There are parades and protests. Then power. All of a sudden, it's theirs, all theirs. Then they rob and they kill. Any ideology preached along the way is just window dressing.

They don't believe what they say. They don't care about winning debates. They don't even want equality. They just want an excuse to destroy everything. They want an excuse to destroy you.

This is what they do.

And this book is how we stop them.

CHAPTER 1

SO YOU THINK YOU KNOW COMMUNISM

The first maxim of your policy ought to be to lead … the people's enemies by terror.
—Maximilien Robespierre

Remember what it was like when you were a child. Did you ever have a bad dream? Most kids do. You might even remember what one of yours was about. When you're little, most nightmares follow the same plot.

Everything starts out fine. Then all of a sudden, it's not.

Something's coming for you. It's big. It's scary.

And it sees you.

You run to hide.

But your legs feel stuck. It's so slow, so hard to move.

It's catching up.

You panic. Throat's dry. Can't stop.

You turn a corner. You're in a hallway. You run. Keep running.

There's a door.

But—it's found you.

Huffing. Heaving. Snarling. Angry. Red eyes.

You open—no.

You can't.

Door's locked.

You pound.

No one hears. No one's coming. Nowhere to run.

Here it comes.

You freeze.

…

And now you wake up.

Did that feel familiar? The most common nightmare we all have is being chased. It's more than just a dream though. It's one of the worst-case scenarios you could ever experience in real

life. There's impending doom, dread incarnate, and no way of escape. You run and run, separated and cornered, trapped. No wonder the panicked heartbeat wakes you up. It's unsettling. Whether you have that bad dream at age five or fifty-five, you probably feel a little haunted for a few hours afterward.

For good reason. There was this predator. It felt so real. But it was worse than a hungry animal. Because it *knew* what it was doing. It saw you. It felt your fear. The more fear it felt, the bigger it got and the slower you ran. A little kid feels helpless in that dream. But the predator? Happy.

Evil thrives on one emotion above all others: **terror**.

And worst of all, they *want* you to feel that terror. Because by the time you do, it's too late to do anything about it.

The first policy of the unhuman is terror, as Robespierre wrote to his fellow leftists.[1] The proto-communist French Revolution left 30,000 dead by guillotine alone. But not before they all felt dread and saw their doom. The guillotine. Forced to walk up there, hands tied so tight wrists bleed. Hearing the cheers like a stadium. Surrounded by hate. No one coming to save them. They knew it. But they couldn't wake up.

The communist uprising thrives on one emotion above all others. By the time you're feeling it, it's too late to do anything about it.

Wake up. Fight back.

If you don't understand communist revolutions, you don't understand the times in which we live. And if you do, then you understand it is time to take action. No one is coming to save us. It is up to us.

As we write this, law and order has been overturned. The prevailing order is in disarray. In fact, it is categorically disordered. In twenty-first-century America, accusations are now evidence; denial is guilt. Activism means open bigotry and actual hate—as long as it's directed at certain unpopular people and "privileged" groups. All statements are taken out of context and twisted with dishonesty for a dunk. Nuance is the enemy. Normal is a problem, and problems are normalized. Crime is punished with neither bail nor jail. Voice concern and you face "lawfare"—financial death by a hundred bad-faith lawsuits. Speak louder and unleash a ravenous appetite for vengeance—to deplatform you, debank your family, and destroy your good name. No prospects for work, bank accounts closed or seized, and reputation in ruin. This is what they do.

To the unbiased observer, this is a cancerous set of tactics and obviously so. And yet they are no surprise. The news constantly documents all this insanity and hypocrisy, and none of it's even new. Patterns of the past make sense of our present. And these patterns foretell a terrifying future we might be destined to endure. After all, "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it," as the prescient George Santayana wrote in 1905.[2]

For nearly 250 years, far-left sociopolitical uprisings have followed the same battle plans—from first call for change, to the last innocent executed; from denial revolution is boiling over, to declaration of the new order.

Wait a minute, you'd be right to cut us off. *Didn't we all learn about communist history in school? Like Stalin, the Cold War, Jacobins, something about Angola … all that stuff?*

You might think you know communism. You don't.

Let us guess; you probably haven't thought about CPUSA recently, have you? (That's the Communist Party USA, FYI.) In fact, this might be the first time you've ever heard of them, or read of someone else mentioning them. Yes, CPUSA is a real political party, founded in 1919.

No, they have no meaningful influence in modern America. So if that's who you associate with "communism," we encourage you to check your reds. The communist cause always has been and always will be a chameleon. Red has many shades. It complements whoever has the power to wedge a society into separate, angry factions, into isolated yet aligned groups of *us* versus *them*. At the time of this writing, CPUSA is the least of our worries. Communism has been rebranded, then and now. This is one of the many covert tactics of the red revolutionary this book reveals. And this conversion is the very reason that good, smart people are shocked, *shocked, I say!* when the revolution comes to their neighborhood. It's in the word. Shocked. Everything starts out fine. Then all of a sudden, it's not. Something's after you.

Red terror. The victims never saw it coming. We wrote this book so you can. This is the untold story of how those who view the world through optics of groups that have power and groups that don't bring down a culture, a country, and a civilization, all through communist revolution, by that very term or another.

This book is also the story of a playbook. A playbook that every far-left uprising, insurrection, and usurpation of order, goodwill, and freedom follows, in the precise order it follows, and what has been done to fight back, for good or for loss. Often, the unhumans do win; after all, the far left has a body count of 100 million. But they do not win every time. And not this time. Yes, the potential for red revolution is baked into every democratic society. Their success is not.

That said, this probably isn't the first book on communism you've read. It might be the first you finish. Here's why. While academic and reference titles explore the motives and agenda of household-name leaders during each left-wing upheaval, this book will give you on-the-ground descriptions of *what it's really like* to witness (and fight) communist forces of change. We have recast the story of communism as individuals against individuals, as real people, to reveal how and why neighbors turn against neighbors. Why even yours might, against you. Along the way, we will reintroduce you to the household names of history, but in a way you've never seen before—we will tell their *true* stories.

And unlike some popular conservative commentators—who are nakedly reactionary and hyperbolically defeatist in their retellings of left-wing political history—this book will offer a measured tone. We will take this subject as seriously as deserved. And in the process, this book will inoculate you and by extension those you love from **ever** falling for revolutionary ideas that accelerate the end of everything. Throughout the book, we will suggest what to do about it. All of it. The unhumans have their playbook; now we're giving you ours. You may skip to the counterrevolutionary system to win, detailed in Chapters 12 and 13, but we don't think you'll want to miss all the groundwork we lay before that. The biggest problem people have when dealing with politics is they think, What can I do though? I can't make a difference. If this is what you think, allow us to prove you wrong.

We have a vested interest in this subject. We, your humble authors, Jack Posobiec and Joshua Lisec, are both fathers. Husbands. Businessmen. Investors in the future. We believe in beauty, truth, law, and order. We believe in the God-given will of the human spirit to build a greater, better world than the one we found ourselves in. And already, that one is gone; the civilization we were both born into no longer exists. There is only one force powerful enough to bring us to this point and beyond: the force of anti-civilization. Unhumanity. We oppose it to the end. There have been many such forces in history and prehistory alike. But those most effective at annihilating everything righteous people held dear—those who have been the "best" at robbing and killing—they have *always* been communists.

So join us on a sweeping and succinct journey through history to learn the untold stories of radical takeovers that textbooks, teachers, and TV documentaries don't tell. From the plains of Spain to the jungles of southeast Asia, from the communist uprising that toppled America's first ally and made a mockery of her righteous revolution, to the end of our own constitutional republic, we will reveal how a global death cult recruits new members, speaks different languages, and emerges on different continents—yet it has but one unchanging purpose: to unhuman anyone in its way. We will cover how this was done, by whom, and what was attempted (or ought to have been) to stop them in the times and places you think you know but may not, such as:

- The French and Haitian Revolutions
- The Russian Revolution and Civil War
- The Spanish Civil War
- The Chinese Civil War and Cultural Revolution
- America's 1960s Revolution and Culture War
- … and more.

What lies ahead is the secret history of radical left-wing uprisings— the rebellions of the aggrieved. It is a warning from the past, to the present, about the unhumans. Theirs is a story more than two thousand years in the making, many episodes of which have gone unseen and unheard. This is the untold story of the communist revolution— and how to stop the next one.

We will explain that communism, like leftism, is not an ideology. It is a tactic of warfare. Communism is a tactic to take power wherever it is applied, and is solely focused on taking power. They launch microrevolutions against their targets. They use irregular warfare. They operate in the fifth-generation warfare grayzone in the modern world. We will explain.

To fight back, conservatives, centrists, moderates, and even good liberals will need to embrace something they have never considered. They must embrace exact reciprocity. That which is done by the communist and the regime must be done unto them. This includes embracing reciprocal lawfare. This includes embracing naming and shaming. This includes embracing boycotts. All of this and more.

The unhumans will not stop until they are stopped. And we must stop them.

CHAPTER 2

THE UNHUMANS ARE COMING

Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities.
—François Marie Arouet de Voltaire

Conservative authors and pundits have been writing about the left for forty-plus years. And for forty-plus years, the United States, and the West as a result, have moved to the Left. Why is this? Our thesis is that the conservative movement has failed to conserve anything worth conserving. This is why we are in the situation we currently find ourselves in, and it is in fact a state of learned helplessness.

Conservatives, centrists, and the right wing lose to the Left because they do not fundamentally understand the Left. Let this be a software upgrade to all who read this. The Cultural Marxist knows that the conservative will cry foul. The conservative will lash out with angry tweets about double standards and hypocrisy. But the Cultural Marxist does not care. The Cultural Marxist views everyone else as either unaware of the goal of the revolution, less than them, or an obstacle standing in their way to be destroyed. Only the revolution matters to the revolutionary. Conservatives have lost years of ground by being obsessed with debating "facts and logic" rather than doing the grubby work of entering institutions and remaking them from inside. The revolutionaries are a generation ahead in this regard. Conservatives are playing catch-up, and the hour is growing late. Time is short. Ultimately, the revolutionary does not care what the conservative says about them. They aren't operating in good faith. These aren't the unintentional consequences of good intentions. Conservatives need to wake up, and wake up now. This is a playbook that has been around longer than the United States itself. And we are reaching the endgame.

But how did we arrive here? Let's go back to how a communist revolution begins. It begins with resentment. Resentment is an emotion bred by those who lose the lottery of life. It's not fair, as life never is. But it *should* be fair, shouldn't it? Those who got more, by luck or by work, should have less. That's only fair. Isn't it?

You've had these thoughts in your life. Everyone has. But you probably never thought that you should kill the people who have more than you. That you should destroy them and their families and all the things they built. Sure you've felt jealous from time to time, but you tamp it down. You're a human, after all. You'd never act on it. And you certainly never formed a group

of like-minded individuals to take those thoughts and put them into action. Such a thing would be criminal. It would be anti-civilizational in the highest order. It would be to deny humanity itself. It would be, in a word, unhuman.

Vladimir Lenin founded the Russian Communist Party in 1912 and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) not long after. He was among other things a master persuader. His open-air speeches and widely distributed writings oozed the politics of resentment. Lenin's hatred for the aristocrats of Russia was palpable. He truly hated the Christian Russian imperials, lords of the many nationalities that the empire encompassed. And his speeches were, of course, persuasive. To whom? To those at the bottom of society: vagrants, thieves, violent criminals, various minorities, and the overall unsuccessful. Lenin would go on to build a new society right on top of the old one, with the bodies of Russian imperials as his bricks. Lenin added something to Marxism. Communist philosopher Karl Marx had thought the workers would eventually rise up on their own. Lenin decided things needed to be sped up through use of a revolutionary vanguard. This became the basis for Leninsim.

The Bolsheviks—these were his earliest followers. In Russian, the word means "the majority." Indeed, many people then and there and here and now feel slighted by life at best, cheated and taken advantage of at worst. No one has ever said life is fair. It isn't. That's not how it works. There are always going to be winners and losers. It's a simple fact of life. But when that fact gets turned into a movement born of anger and vengeance, the violence is never far away. The unhumans bring it.

Vladimir Lenin was chief unhuman of his day. Millions would die under his revolution and later his regime. This, to the Bolshevik mind, was good. *Fair*. From the haves, everything was taken: life, liberty, property. Envy and vengeance unleashed. A broken world was not repaired; it was, to use a favorite left-ism, "dismantled." But that does not mean Russia's have-nots got their justice or even equality. They did not. Lenin brought no great reforms to ease burdens or alleviate (or prevent) suffering. No, the communist Bolsheviks robbed and they killed. Everyone, everywhere, who would not pledge allegiance to the cause or stood in the way. Many who did were killed anyway. This is what they do.

Here is what conservatives still fail to grasp:

Unhumans *still* support communism after it killed 100 million people in the twentieth century. They are not bothered that communism killed 100 million people. In fact, they think 100 million deaths is just a good start. Those wholly possessed by resentment want to 10X that number. On a base level, unhumans seek the death of the successful and the desecration of the beautiful. They want to smash civilization. And so whenever and wherever they gain power, they do. And yet, conservatives would rather whine about equal treatment while unhumans are drawing them toward freshly dug graves.

Unhumans live to persecute the normal, once they take power. Anyone who calls them out for the crime of noticing their schemes is then subjected to a "struggle session." They're humiliated, unpersoned. In this way, victims of the far left become unhuman themselves, brought down to the resenters' gutter. The purpose of a system is what it does. Radicals cow the middle into silence, for anyone could lose everything by speaking up. And so they do. It's only fair, they say.

You'll notice throughout this book the persistent, perennial unhuman obsession with clichéd sociopolitical objectives like "fairness" and "equality." *I am equal to you*, the have-nots always say to the haves. But their meaning is not what the Founding Fathers spoke of with regard to

equality under law. This, Friedrich Nietzsche understood. Nietzsche is quoted as saying, "No one is more inferior than those who insist on being equal." The unhuman desires not to build a better world than the old one with its very real and also feigned issues, but to cut down and destroy all individual achievement and cultural greatness so that the world is as miserable as they are.

Wherever they emerge, unhumans first begin by amassing a following. Mass media programming is key for domination, for the mental conditioning that their way is the best way, the only way, the fair way. This is how relativistic multiculturalism was embedded into the Western psyche, by the way, this ubiquitous belief that no one culture or society is better than another so can't we all just get along. And yet no country or people on earth lived in such a way naturally for all of history. When mass migration dilutes and unbalances a shared culture, there is one force alone powerful enough to hold it all together: an all-powerful state at the center. Only great empires have maintained multiple ethnic groups living within their borders simultaneously, keeping everyone in line with the overwhelming power of the emperor's unyielding hand. These were not republics with civil liberties and equal standing for all classes. It is unlikely a republic could exist in such a condition. Be careful what you wish for, conservative.

The conservative fails to comprehend that freedom cannot exist in the sociopolitical sense without shared culture and shared value systems that agree on what freedom is and from what (or Whom) it derives. Without common culture, only that all-powerful government can keep diverse populations from ethnic, religious, and other conflicts—until they have had time to assimilate, that is. Consider how Irish, Italians, Germans, Polish, and other Euro-American groups fought against one another in nineteenth-century American cities. And yet today, all are simply "white Americans." In Colonial America, the division was mostly along religious lines. Now, there is peace between and among them. Why? Common culture—American culture inherited from Western civilization. Neither a nation nor a city can be constituted from any chance collection of people, or in any chance period of time, without assimilation into a new metagroup to which all groups belong, e.g., "American" versus "Irish American," "Italian American," and so on. Indeed, most of history's cities that admitted settlers, either at the time of their founding or later, have been troubled by warring factions, usually factions of people of have-not status. But to the unhuman, they see mass migration differently. This is not a problem, to the unhuman. It is an opportunity. "It is a mark of a tyrant to have men of foreign extraction rather than citizens as guests at table and companions, feeling that citizens are hostile but strangers make no claim against him," wrote Aristotle.[1]

Notice the clear assignment of have and have-not roles in the context of unassimilated mass migration into preexisting cultures. Citizens are the oppressors; they have rights, responsibilities, and more. And those entering their territory, legally or illegally, are immediately the oppressed, for they have not those rights or responsibilities. They are stuck in the fringes of society, and do not have access to the wider economic and cultural life of the country. Even this group is further separated into who is oppressed the most. Legal immigrants are deemed more prosperous than illegal migrants and thus are subjected to cruel and unusual legal torture. Ask anyone who has attempted to seek legal immigration status much less citizenship in the United States and you will be left in disbelief if not tears; the US immigration system is currently a form of anarcho-tyranny. The purpose of a system is what it does. And the purpose of United States immigration law is to benefit the have-nots and the expense of all others. It's *unfair* that not everyone can afford an immigration lawyer. And so those who can't or won't are thus granted special status—that of the oppressed.

Unhumans in command of a political apparatus, be that an immigration system, criminal

justice. or otherwise, indulge in anarcho-tyranny. This explains much about immigration, among other issues plaguing empires and republics of past and present for reasons Aristotle elucidated.

What is this anarcho-tyranny? Anarcho-tyranny is the selective overenforcement of laws against a target population alongside the selected *non*enforcement of laws on another target population. This is the case in the present-day United States, as it has been in all societies being groomed for radical takeover and violent revolution. Perhaps the most famous illustration of real-world anarcho-tyranny is one attributed to Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, author of *The Gulag Archipelago* and chronicler of numerous Lenin and Joseph Stalin–era crimes against humanity:

> For him to have a knife was mere misbehavior, tradition, he didn't know any better. But for you to have one was "terrorism."

It is the oppressed who are released on account of mere misbehavior, their prior tradition, or lack of knowledge. *It's only fair*. And for the oppressors from here, well, you should have known better. You will be punished to the fullest extent. Will conservatives ever figure this out, or will they continue to impotently point out double standards? Only action and reciprocity will change the behavior of the revolutionary.

Unhumans then and now are known for criminalizing self-defense and defending criminals. Again from Solzhenitsyn:

> In the Criminal Code of 1926, there was a most stupid Article 139—"on the limits of necessary self-defense"—according to which you had the right to unsheath your knife only after the criminal's knife was hovering over you.
>
> And you could stab him only after he had stabbed you. Otherwise, you would be the one put on trial. (And there was no article in our legislation saying that the greater criminal was the one who attacked someone weaker than himself.)
>
> This fear of exceeding the measure of necessary self-defense led to total spinelessness as a national characteristic.
>
> A hoodlum once began to beat up the Red Army man Aleksandr Zakharov outside a club.
>
> Zakharov took out a folding penknife and killed the hoodlum. And for this, he got ten years for plain murder! "And what was I supposed to do?" he asked, astonished. Prosecutor Artsishevsky replied: "You should have fled!"[2]

Unhumans live in a dark alternate reality where "should" is an argument, suspending all critical thought. If you do not do as you "should" have, and as criminals do as they "should" not, only law-abiding citizens are going to have a bad time.

Past, meet present. We witnessed this inversion of law and order to a cartoonish extent in the summer of 2020. On May 25, 2020, in Minneapolis, Minnesota, eight-time convicted criminal George Floyd was stopped by police officers on suspicion of attempting to pass a counterfeit bill. What happened in the next few minutes drew more attention from the global public than the year's COVID-19 pandemic.[3] You probably know. Officer Derek Chauvin restrained a cuffed Floyd on the ground, who famously said, "I can't breathe." In fact, he said this before he was even placed on the ground. Floyd's death was later ruled a homicide by the county chief medical examiner, and Chauvin was sentenced to twenty-two-and-a-half years in prison for murder. What

was lost among the international ire and calls for Chauvin's head were other facts of the matter, such as:

- Floyd had both fentanyl and methamphetamine in his system at time of death.[4] Specifically, he had 11 ng/mL of fentanyl in his system.[5] "Blood concentrations of approximately 7 ng/ml or greater have been associated with fatalities where poly-substance use was involved."[6]
- "If he were found dead at home alone and no other apparent causes, this could be acceptable to call an OD," wrote that same county medical examiner, seemingly telling a different story in private than public.[7] "That is a fatal level of fentanyl under normal circumstances," he wrote elsewhere.[8]
- In March 2020, two months prior to the altercation with Minneapolis police, Floyd had overdosed so severely he was hospitalized.[9]
- In April, Floyd had contracted COVID-19. In the autopsy, Floyd tested positive for coronavirus.[10]
- The autopsy, freely available online, states these words: "No life-threatening injuries identified."[11]
- Floyd had underlying conditions including heart disease, with one artery blocked 75 percent.[12, 13]

Despite all this evidence, the only verdict that could have been issued was guilty. Why? The American mind had already adopted the oppressor versus oppressed frame. And in this context, the white Chauvin was the oppressor and the black Floyd oppressed. Therefore, any and all possible if not likely causes of Floyd's death that were *not* the fault of police were dismissed, by the public, the jury, and local authorities. (One of the jurors condemning Chauvin apparently lied to the judge, claiming no prior knowledge of Floyd's death despite having publicly posted about his anti-police activism and attending George Floyd rallies in the months after the news broke.[14])

To sum the story up, in the oppressor-oppressed context, Floyd "didn't know any better;" he couldn't have possibly died from anything other than premeditated murder. Mindset has consequences.

Now, all this background is necessary to understand the context of the police-free zones in Seattle, Washington and Portland, Oregon. In the wake of Floyd's death and Chauvin's arrest, there were more than 7,750 demonstrations in protest, with upward of 26 million Americans participating across more than 40 percent of all counties in the US.[15, 16, 17] Some protesters stuck around after the initial marches and riots. Such was the case in both Seattle and Portland, where up went tent cities and out went the police. Among other events, the declaration of the "Capitol Hill Autonomous Zone" or CHAZ, in Seattle, with a copycat soon after in Portland. Seattle's CHAZ began like many protests and riots did that summer, as an organized national uprising by the so-called oppressed against their oppressors—specifically, the black community versus the police. Of course, in Seattle, most people on both sides were white. In Seattle, city police abandoned the East Precinct building following nightly swarms of protesters; police and staff there deemed the mobs a safety risk and withdrew for their own protection. Protesters got right to building a communist microutopia, with emergent leaders declaring the area's independence

from all recognized authority. It would be hilarious if it weren't lawless— and soon deadly.

Seattle mayor Jenny Durkan approved every bit of it. She reframed the anarchy of CHAZ as an attempt to "de-escalate interactions" between protesters and police, as tensions had been high following the popularized, politicized death of Floyd.[18] The voices of more than one thousand counterprotesters who called for Durkan's resignation went unheard.[19] With police presence entirely removed, the CHAZ saw exactly what you'd expect: all the fixings of a hippie festival but with widespread looting and violence committed against small business owners and residents in the Capitol Hill neighborhood. There were multiple mass shootings and several murders, none of which have been officially solved. No one was coming to save the residents; they were hostages in their own homes. Some who escaped were prohibited by police from returning in hopes of saving valuables or defending their property. Across the CHAZ, there was sexual assault (as there had been during the infamous Occupy Wall Street protests that inspired CHAZ) and also arson, all effectively city-sanctioned.[20] Anarcho-tyranny. This is what they do. (All of this, including firsthand experiences in CHAZ, are further detailed in Posobiec's book *The Antifa: Stories from Inside the Black Bloc*, published 2021.)

Consider what you might be feeling right now. Indignation. Righteous anger. Your mind begins to wander … to what you would do, in a CHAZ near you. When it's illegal to defend your liberty and property but legal to seize and destroy it. The Seattle CHAZ lasted twenty-four days; the one in Portland, five hours. A lot can happen in five minutes when the mob is outside your door. Are you really safe?

And yet these thoughts, according to the unhuman, condemn you. Only an oppressor worries about stuff, stuff you gained through a systematically racist capitalist system. It's not fair. Why shouldn't you have all your stuff seized? The oppressed robbing and killing the oppressor. That's equity. That's fair. Lenin would be proud.

This is how these people think, or doublethink in some cases. This is why certain people and groups receive the benefit of *all* doubt and other people and other groups get none. Why white is presumed guilty and black innocent. Why property owners are made to submit to the will of armed mobs by their own government. Why Floyd received the national funeral parade of royalty and millions of suffering loved ones were held in isolation away from family members during simultaneous bans on large gatherings. Why progressive voices praise the arson, looting, and destruction of cities but condemn those very acts when their neighborhoods are targeted.[21] Why trespassing mobs of hundreds strong breaking into private property are assumed innocent, and the homeowners brandishing firearms to protect their property were arrested, charged, fined, and had those weapons seized—in one surreal case from the summer of 2020, that of Mark and Patricia McCloskey.[22] This is what they do.

The entire situation is as absurd as it is real. How could we have reached this point without millions of good, smart people noticing? Doing something about it? Voting for the protection of their own rights? What's going on here?

Why didn't conservatives notice any of this happening?

How Did We Get Here?

For conservatives to receive their software upgrade to understand what's really going on in the world, they have to understand the oppressor-oppressed filter through which all news, entertainment, education, and even law and policy are forced through before they reach them. This will take time, but we hope that by the end of this book, it will be a new filter and mental

model to understand the world.

By and large, classic liberals, conservatives, and even moderates do not understand what is going on in a societal system where the chief institutions of consensus-making are controlled by radicals and infiltrated by unhumans. During the peak racial panic of 2020, when asked to guess how many unarmed black men were killed by police each year, the average person on the street would respond with outrageous numbers that seemed to merit the violent anti-police protests swarming cities nationwide and leaving whole neighborhoods in ruin and burning rubble. This is not conjecture. Of progressive Americans actually surveyed, more than half thought that black deaths at the hands of police number more than 1,000 per year. Half of conservatives polled got the answer wrong, too.[23] The correct number is thirteen—according to the most comprehensive records available, compiled by of all places the *Washington Post*.[24] Add to this the fact that "instances of police use of force remain exceedingly rare and that rates of fatal officer-involved shootings … are generally lower in the past 10 years than in decades past."[25]

We have the unhuman-occupied media to thank for this skewed belief about the nature of reality, the *Washington Post* one of the guiltiest parties. Even the accurate number—thirteen, which was the number recorded in 2019—may be misleadingly high. WaPo's own database opens with dishonest framing of Michael Brown as "unarmed black man."[26] But according to the official Department of Justice report, Brown attacked a police officer—Darren Wilson—and attempted to take his gun and kill him. Brown, also much larger than Wilson, appeared to be drawing his own weapon. Darren Wilson acted in self-defense. And yet his example demonstrates that the unhumans leave out the context of what "unarmed black men" were doing to get themselves shot. We saw that same narrative-bending with George Floyd and Derek Chauvin. This is what they do.

A recent Manhattan Institute report found cause and effect between misleading overemphasis on those few fatal officer-involved shootings in the black community each year, and negative racial bias in public perception of police.[27] Meanwhile, an empirical study from Harvard University found no statistical difference between police shootings of black and white suspects.[28]

People who accept this and other narratives are known as "normies," who could also be called "NPR-Americans" as they believe the "official" sources. They've endured two to three generations of social conditioning through the education system, mass media, and Hollywood to distort how they make sense of the world so that fake becomes real and real becomes racist conspiracy theory.

This is what bestselling author and persuasion expert Scott Adams calls the "two movies on one screen" phenomenon.[29] When people have their mental model provided to them from misleading input provided by institutions opposed to the flourishing of the American citizen, they form completely false impressions of the world all around them, causing them to interpret fact and information through that false lens. This is why, for example, when a public figure complains of systemic racism impeding the progress of black Americans and they are asked to provide an example, they present their perception. Opinion. How it feels. *Unfair*. We don't even need an example as controversial as the death of George Floyd to see this. The completely false perception of how our world works maps onto other sociopolitical matters beyond police violence.

Another two movies, one screen example was the outrage over the Nick Sandmann video, in which a young teenager stood on the steps on the Lincoln Memorial, face-to-face with a Native American chanter. This video went viral online on the left and was said to be an example of

white nationalist harassment. Here was a have and a have-not, oppressor versus oppressed. The *Washington Post* and numerous other media outlets picked it up. And yet the video depicts no racism, bigotry, or anything at all to it. The high school student simply stood still with an awkward smile and said nothing to the Native American man. Why then did the media report it as an obvious example of emboldened white nationalism under President Donald J. Trump? Why did everyone who outrage-shared it "see" racism in the clip despite no verbal cues to such or physical gestures? This is due to coding. If you have been "coded" (programmed) for years by Hollywood content, progressive education, and the mass media to perceive a white male in a Make America Great Again hat as a racist oppressor and any and all Native Americans as oppressed victims, then that is what you will see in any given situation despite a total and complete lack of evidence. As it turns out, it was actually the Native American chanter who was harassing Sandmann and his classmates, who were simply visiting the Lincoln Memorial on a trip to DC.

The key to understanding this is the power of persuasion. If the institutions that create our society's mental model are infiltrated by radicals who hate those they deem oppressors, then public perception is decided in advance. Millions of people—including white Americans, conservative Republicans, and even President Trump supporters—watched a video and "saw" an unrepentant white nationalist oppressing a brave Native American victim. This was a big problem, and conservatives did not push back on the narrative for at least twenty-four hours when the story first broke.

Feelings Don't Care about Facts

This is the struggle we find ourselves in today. Propaganda works, and the Western world has been oversaturated with it for decades. Because of their fried mental model, the normies think they are helping when they share a video calling for the arrest and punishment of an otherwise innocent teenage boy.

The scandal was fake, the reporting was fake, but the emotions were real. And when those emotions are whipped up into political and kinetic action, the unhumans can take power. This is what they do.

Another example of a fried mental model in action is the life-altering surgeries done to children who spend too much time on TikTok. Again, the normies involved supporting this do not have malicious intent nor are they doing it for money. That may be a bitter pill to swallow, but it is the truth. They are simply thinking and acting from a useless mental model. *I'm helping!* Understand that the original purpose of the sociopolitical left was the goal of alleviating immediate suffering; they had a heart and hands to help the have-nots. And the original purpose of the sociopolitical right has been to design social and political systems to prevent or mitigate such suffering in the first place—and to offer a straightforward path for have-nots to become haves of their own volition. There are fair criticisms of the right and their inability to follow through on their aims. But the left continues to promise what they used to deliver but no longer do. Handouts and handups are not meant to help the have-nots; they exist to hurt the haves, through oppressive taxation, burdensome regulation, and that good ole anarcho-tyranny. This is what they do.

The unhumans know exactly what they are doing to bring us to this point. Their motive and agenda are well-nigh undetectable to those untrained in mass manipulation and dark psychology. They flood propaganda throughout society, greatly aided in our time by near-infinitely scalable social media, and tell the normies that genital removal and breast amputation are "life-saving

healthcare." Such messaging hooks the maternal instinct for care and the paternal instinct for protection. Trying to explain to normies with "facts" on this and other politicized matters is particularly ineffective because they have already been coded via emotional messaging to convince them otherwise. The unhumans use emotional messaging to push their agendas particularly because of its effectiveness, and the only way to counteract it is with emotional counter-messaging. "Facts don't care about your feelings," you've heard it said. But we say unto you, "Feelings don't care about your facts." This is why conservatives have missed the boat.

What the unhumans are up to in the present-day USA differs little from their ways in times past. All classic communist messaging divides society up between the oppressor class and the oppressed victims. Unhumans set up their messaging strategy in this way out of resentment patterns. The successful cannot have their success out of excellence or actual achievement. It must be due to them cheating somehow. Take your pick of nefarious reasons: exploitation of the workers, oppression of women, systemic racism. These are Marxist messaging strategies deployed upon a functioning society to destabilize it and bring the unhumans to power. This is what they crave more than anything.

You see, unhumans are coded to seek status more than they seek happiness and comfort. This is due to their resentment at losing life's lottery and full embrace of cynicism. The systems unhumans build are ones built on an inversion of the merit-based social order, one where status is determined by adherence to ideology, extent of your self-reported victimization, and above all, loyalty to the party.

This is why communists recruit before doing anything else. They organize, as we'll explore further in Chapter 4. Think about why. If your coalition depends on the loyalty of fringe groups, how do you expand your coalition? What would you do? You would import as many fringe groups and minorities as you could from all over the world. Leftists understand that to dilute the political power of the majority, they must open borders and pull as many distinct groups from around the world as possible, except Europe. To add to the majority would weaken the political power of the institutional left, which has built its intersectional power through the "coalition of the fringes," as Steve Sailer dubbed it.[30] The formula is simple: Increase the strength of your coalition through numbers as much as possible. It doesn't even matter if some of the newcomers oppose you at first or vote for the opposition. All that matters is that you keep bringing more into society to increase the ratio of fringes so that, ironically, the fringes overwhelm society. The more groups that owe their status and financial well-being to their loyalty to the unhumans, the more political power the unhumans gain. The unhumans are not interested in winning the debate. They are interested in expanding their power and taking yours.

This is now the case throughout the West. They have even gone so far as to enlist the financial and logistical support of global organizations run by well-meaning people. Catholic, Jewish, and other faith-based and aid groups such as the American Red Cross have been found to traffic illegal immigrants from the third world into the United States.[31, 32, 33] Nearly three-quarters of Americans believe these individuals come to America to "find jobs and improve their lives."[34] Is that the case for the military-age males not from Central America but from communist China as well as known terrorists and anti-Semitic extremists?[35, 36, 37] Or is this, as some authorities have said, tantamount to an "invasion" of the United States?[38] Whatever you call it, we can confirm the unfettered illegal immigration is aided and abetted by the United States government itself alongside those NGOs. Under the President Joseph Biden administration, illegal border-crossers regardless of intent do not need to sneak over or worry

about being caught. The administration's official policy is to "catch and release" those breaking federal immigration law. That is, illegal migrants find federal immigration authorities while breaking and entering into the US, receive aid, and are sent on their way into the homeland.[39] Visionary entrepreneur Elon Musk summed up the situation in this way:

> The far left US administration is using your tax dollars to fly violent criminals into America.[40]

The stark difference between immigration perception and reality is odd until you understand the fried brain model. It is the spirit of charity, hijacked. And so otherwise compassionate Catholics, Jews, and others import into their own midst those who are not ashamed to express their bigotry toward religious minorities. *I'm helping!* Conservatives are wrong about the intent behind the work they are assisting. Leftists do not have good intentions. We cannot vote our way out of this.

Meanwhile, we observe no significant organized or well-funded opposition to any of this. The fried mental model explains why. So many everyday people and conservative and moderate leaders they elect have been affected by unhuman coding their entire lives. Without even knowing it. Suddenly, a group appears that claims to stand for reforming these terrible conditions that society has imposed on the oppressed. Only a monster would stand against them, right? That would be mean, and you might get called bad names by internet leftists. And so we get feckless leaders at all levels and in all areas who are afraid to take action against the waves of attacks by the unhumans and their destabilization forces lest they be accused of the same nefarious wrongthink they claim they are fighting against. Concerned about unvetted illegal immigrants showing up with fake passports? You must be xenophobic. Oppose the money-laundering operation known as Black Lives Matter? You're racist then. Abstaining from the Women's March? Must be a misogynist. Disagree with genital amputations and hysterectomies performed on children? OK, transphobe. Dislike Antifa? Congratulations, you're literally a fascist. Conservatives fear being called names, regardless of the truth of the accusation. We argue that if you are *not* inciting an unhuman backlash against you, you don't want victory bad enough. Conservative leaders do not. They attempt to reason with unreasonables. Normies just don't get it. For those who do, we will offer pragmatic solutions in Chapter 13.

Now, even when the unhumans do not disagree with what you say or do, they will punish you for saying and doing it, if they deem you an oppressor. This explains the strange fate of the aforementioned Scott Adams, who was famously "canceled" by far-left press and media in 2023, despite his reputation as a lifelong liberal. His one and only offense was to state a viewpoint that *no one disagreed with*. Through truthful hyperbole, Adams advised Americans to stay away from embittered groups who hate them. That's it, that's the crime. And for this he was named and shamed on major networks, in mainstream publications, and by social media influencers with massive followings.[41] All despite that lack of disagreement. Scott Adams said nothing wrong; what was wrong was *that* he said it. According to that left-wing "movie," in which the theme of every major story is oppressor versus oppressed, Adams must be universally scorned for what he said. Here's why: Scott Adams, being both the creator of *Dilbert* the most successful personal development author of all time, is a quintessential "have." And his self-proclaimed enemies allege they represent the interests of the have-nots, whom Adams said collectively fit the definition of a "hate group." And so Adams faced the full force and fury of a global unhuman uprising against his life's work. This is what they do.

These strategies have been employed to terrify conservatives, moderates, casual liberals, and all normal people into inaction for over a century since the Bolsheviks first marched—and the tactics keep working. And so the environment is well-prepared for revolution. It's as if they'll be able to win without fighting.

CHAPTER 3

SUN TZU RED: HOW COMMUNISTS WIN BEFORE FIGHTING

To subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill.

—Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*

Imagine you wanted to end current society as we know it and remake it in your own image and vision. But you don't have the nuclear launch codes to threaten leaders to step down. No bioweapons or other advanced technology either. You're just a dude with a vendetta. Suppose you didn't want to hurt any one specific person. You want to take out them *all*. All the enemies who uphold current society, and stand in your way, and those who look, talk, and work like them. You are the *us* and they are the *them*. So you want to destroy the society "they" built and maintain for themselves at your expense. How would you do it? Well, you'd infiltrate, subvert, and overturn the existing order is what you would do. You would stage a revolution. To do it, you would follow the path laid by every red revolutionary—a path that begins with a strategic advantage the guardians of that society did not foresee. You would stack the odds in your favor so heavily that it would almost be as though you were winning without ever fighting. Oh, you'd still fight. You'd just be locking up the odds of victory before that battle even began.

There is a method to weaponize madness. And the irony is that there is a similar procedure developed and deployed by the most orderly and disciplined institution you can think of: the United States military. This procedure enables winning before fighting and it is called "Operational Preparation of the Environment," or OPE. OPE is inherently tied to US military special forces. (Our man Jack may know a thing or two about this from his prior employer.)

> OPE is primarily an enabling tactic that facilitates future … operations. It is an amalgam of lesser activities combined to minimize surprise and manage uncertainty by leveraging the capabilities and assets at the disposal of special operations forces to shape the environment. The "environment" that is being shaped, or "prepared," includes both the physical environment and "human terrain."[1]

Special forces OPE can involve shaping operations. Shaping operations are small actions and changes to the environment to create the conditions for victory in the larger battle before the opponent even knows one is coming. The academic description that comes to us by way of the Pentagon gives us a lot to work with. The short of the long is that OPE **reduces surprise and risk** by **influencing** the **places and people** where and upon whom **future activities** will occur. Official US military documents explain the *how* of OPE's *what* like so:

> [OPE activities seek] to acquire real-time target-specific information to facilitate potential target prosecution and preliminary engagement of the target to find, fix, track, monitor, or influence the objective prior to conduct of operations.[2]

This additional layer completes our understanding, specifically the key phrases "target-specific" and "influence the objective." It's intelligence-gathering meets military operation, all *before* "conduct of operations." It's asymmetric information—*we know something they don't*—and a panopticon—*we can see you, but you can't see us.* If you're the target, that's terrifying. And we know the thing about terror—by the time it overcomes you, it's too late.

In other words, effective operational preparers know who to target, where they are, what they're up to, with whom, and why—to all but guarantee success when they do finally move on that unsuspecting target. It's the Sun Tzu strategy: Win before fight. You can probably recall two or three famous military victories that relied on OPE, from George Washington crossing the Delaware to D-Day 1944. The brief we cite in the first OPE definition details recent intelligence and military fusion operations. For one high-profile example, OPE is ultimately how SEAL Team Six found and stormed Osama bin Laden's compound without alerting the warlord-terrorist to their presence.

It turns out, what works for a covert mission also works on the masses and likewise to shed blood. Not of a few ultra-guilty men, but to innocents, too, and by the thousands.

Here's how leftists operationally prepare a society for chaos and carnage.

The Pre-Revolution

When we extrapolate our understanding of OPE onto the pre-revolution, we can both hindcast and forecast exactly how communist revolutionaries employ it. This is what they do.

Every revolution begins the same way: Radicals divide and conquer society. Envy and hatred are a communicable virus and secondary infection, and they spread among the most "immunocompromised." That is, the unhumans divide cultures into categories, then infect perceived allies who have the greatest grievances over alleged unfairness, actual inequality, or both. Historically, that separation has been done by economic class, but more recently by race, and gender, and by both immutable and mutable (changeable) characteristics. After the dividing comes the conquering; we'll talk more about the latter in Chapter 4. For now, we'll talk division strategy, as that's how the unhumans and the angry masses who follow them "find, fix, track, monitor, or influence the objective."

The great irony of all their effort is that whenever communists have successfully seized power, they inevitably create a new society with greater and clearly indisputable unfairness and inequality. Because somebody has to manage the transition to utopia, right? That's the vanguard. More on that later. And so the power promised to the aggrieved many accrues to the few who are cruelest. This is what they do. Every. Single. Time. Communism, Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism,

Leftism—whatever we call it—is not ideological. It's tactical. As author Devon Eriksen writes:

> Marxism isn't an ideology at all … it's a tactic. It is simply the weaponized narrative of unilateral oppressor and oppressed, applied to whatever problem the storyteller has.[3]

This is what they do.

How Radicals Prepare Your Environment for Destruction

Since the objective of OPE is to minimize the preparers' own surprise and manage the uncertainty (risks) of an uprising, our objective is to minimize *our* surprise and raise *their* risk. The more communists know about you and your society, the more effective they can divide it. In turn, the more you know about how they do this, the better you can defend yourself and everything you hold dear. The unhumans are coming, but we can be ready for them.

Dividing a Society, in Three Simple Steps

In one word each, revolutionaries prepare the way for revolution by:

1. **The Separation Stage**
2. **The Messaging Stage**
3. **The Infiltration Stage**

Naturally, this three-part operation involves collecting real-time information about a society and doing something with it. We have broken this down into Communist OPE. Let's start with the first step.

Communist OPE, Stage 1: The Separation

The pre-revolution playbook begins with **separating** a society into distinct categories according to grievance. In every time and at every place, this great sorting is into the haves and the have-nots. The haves are de facto oppressors and the have-nots, the oppressed. These are "the two great hostile camps," as *The Communist Manifesto* states.[4]

The Separation Stage processes assignment of blame and guilt. That is, the have-nots, well, *have not*, because the haves, *have*. And the reason must be due to *oppression*. Oppressors oppress the oppressed. To prepare for an uprising, communists further "acquire real-time target-specific information" as to which specific classes, professions, races, genders, ages, and so on are likeliest to align with their cause—to self-report some grievance, real or imagined—and which are likeliest to oppose it. This is how that's gone.

In pre-revolutionary Russia, the Separation Stage was not difficult; in fact, it was already underway prior to the arrival of Vladimir Lenin and his gang of thugs. Deep social divisions are the mark of all aging empires. There *was* real disenfranchisement from landownership. The Russian serfdom system paralleled slavery in the United States in many ways. Peasant laborers, born serfs, were slaves by another name until 1861. That's when that system officially transitioned into debt slavery; serfs were given land but had to reimburse the landowner for it, which plunged them into exorbitant debt worse than current student loan interest rates.

During that period, any resistance to imperial rule, even peaceful, was crushed. Those behind

primitive revolts and systematic strikes across industrializing Russia were treated like war criminals. In countries all around the world, the Industrial Revolution was a catalyst for great change, great concentration of wealth, and even greater social turmoil. Even the briefest reading of what life was like for the have-nots in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russia shows a deep longing for reform of the living standards of the common man. There were compassionate voices, like famed novelist Leo Tolstoy, who, in *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*, published in 1894, advocated nonviolent, Christian resistance to the ironclad Tsarist ways. That and other Tolstoy writings later moved Mahatma Gandhi to lead a peaceful uncoupling of India from the British empire. That, too, could have gone the way of the communist. But the Indian independence movement did not. In Russia, however, there were radical instigators who would have it another way.

Communists generally identify and exploit preexisting fissures in a society by creating a vision of hope and empowerment, with the promise that the utopia will be achieved once the existing social order is overthrown and anyone in the way thrown in jail or murdered. This promise soon accrued Russian communists—called Bolsheviks—a following. (In contrast to Russia, other oppressor-versus-oppressed divisions have been fake because the people of other times and places have been better off. Then when radicals have come to power, they were *worse* oppressors, but armed with literacy, electricity, planes, trains, and automobiles.)

The Separation Stage identifies and isolates the best candidates for the have category and those of the have-not. This was straightforward for the Bolsheviks prior to the 1917 Russian Revolution. There was the bourgeoisie, and there was the proletariat—the aristocrats, owners, and landlords, set against the working class, respectively. Alongside the urban laborers were the rural peasantry. Natural allies in the struggle against the Tsar.

There were also the supporters of Nicholas II, the royal dynasty, and the Russian traditions—and of course, those who stood to gain from Russian industrialization. Many of these individuals, as we will see, formed the White Army. However, anyone opposed to imperialism, aristocracy, and big business could become natural allies of the revolution. The Bolsheviks knew this.

But even among the communists there was internal strife. Another faction within the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party besides the Bolsheviks was the Mensheviks. They believed in glacial-paced socialist change rather than the bloody Bolshevik avalanche. Despite being on the same team, this made the Mensheviks enemies of change. Lenin was direct about this.

Fifteen years prior to the assassination of Tsar Nicholas II and the shocking murder of his wife and children, Lenin published *What Is to Be Done?*, which concludes that "the opportunist rearguard will be replaced by the genuine vanguard of the most revolutionary class."[5] Already, Lenin had identified (and rejected) those familiar with the philosophy and literature of Marxism but who were unwilling to engage in what his pamphlet describes as "militant Marxism." But ultimately, a nation and people in long overdue need of reform and rights were promised both but received neither.

The communist takeover of Spain and the subsequent civil war follow the same plot points, both in the operational preparation of the environment for radical change and in the eventual violence itself. Where the details change is the time, the place, and the people.

The big stuff carries over. For example, the legacy of all feudal societies frustrates their transformation into industrial nations. The medieval world was built to prevent social mobility. This was of obvious benefit to some; the haves could keep having, and the have-nots could never take it. But free markets—capitalism—have done more than any other economic system to raise the world's tired, poor, and huddled masses out of feudal stagnation and into self-generated

prosperity.[6] And yet *The Communist Manifesto* criticizes individual success; self-empowerment is ironically a knock *against* the free market system, to the unhuman.

> The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage laborers.[7]

God forbid that doctors, lawyers, and inventors arc their own careers in the direction of greatest compensation. And of course, communists slaughter the clergy together with the freethinking artists once they take power, so that point is moot. In fact, every communist uprising targets the Church first. You understand why we call this business of revolution a tactic, not a philosophy. Its hypocrisy, contradiction, and illogic are features, not bugs.

The unhumans found Spain ripe for harvest. For centuries there, like much of the Old World, the haves were: the aristocracy and landowning elites with their large estates and control of the nation's agricultural resources, the Catholic Church with their perennial social influence, merchants, and with the coming of the Industrial Revolution, industrialists. Meanwhile, the have-nots were and had been for just as long the majority of the population—peasants who worked the land, the urban poor who toiled and soiled in factories, miners whose blood/sweat/tears enriched the industrialists, and other day laborers who generally had no control over their own material fate.

The Communist Manifesto message of siccing the have-nots on the haves had spread around the world by the turn of the century. Vladimir Lenin gave it a structure in 1919 when he created the Communist International (Comintern), an organization of communist parties whose stated purpose was to use the Russian treasury he had seized to promote world revolution and whose actual purpose was to grant the newly formed Soviet Union total globalist control of all communist movements on earth. It lasted from 1919 to 1943. (See *Communist OPE, Stage 2: Messaging* to learn how the unhumans gained the trust of Spain's working poor.)

What communists do anywhere, they do everywhere. And so the Separation Stage came to Spain. In the decades leading up to their civil war, leftists recognized inter-institutional conflicts they could exploit. There were, by the early 1930s, the royals, self-interested political parties, the military class, the Catalonia and Basque independence movements (which remain a thing to this day), the landowners, the Church, and again, all the have-nots who made up the vast majority of all populations across all areas of Spain: urban, rural, coastal.

With the situation in hand, the unhumans would go on to do what unhumans do: They raped and they murdered. In 1936, the left-wing Popular Front government launched an anti-Catholic campaign of terror and murdered thousands of clergy alongside devout believers—martyrs for the faith. Why this first? The Separation Stage had uniquely scapegoated the Catholic Church. Of all the "have" groups available to target and carry out robbing and killing against, the Church was the stablest. They had power and influence, which they had held with stability and honor for centuries even as monarchs and dictators came and went. And so the radical socialist republic of Spain would disestablish the Church when the time came, looting and burning churches, murdering priests and nuns (after raping them on altars) with impunity, and constructing sacrilegious tributes to communism, assembled with stolen icons and other sacred artifacts. An iconic photo from that period shows Spanish socialists shooting a statue of Jesus Christ, execution-style. This is what they do.

The unhumans of Spain would also come for the landowners, literally "separating" them from ownership of their land. *Nice farmland you have there. Would be a shame if someone nationalized it*. This happened a lot.

In China, the early years of communist influence prior to revolution were protracted and saw multiple wars, reforms, uprisings, and unrest that brought the two-thousand-year Chinese empire to an end. This occurred in 1911 with the abdication of the last emperor, Puyi, of the Qing dynasty, which had ruled since 1644. Imperial China had faced a multitude of challenges that eroded its power and legitimacy, eventually leading to the downfall of the old ways. These included:

- The Opium Wars with the British Empire—1839–1842 then 1856–1860—which resulted in humiliating defeats for China and loss of economic sovereignty. That is putting it lightly.
- The Taiping Rebellion of 1850–1864, one of the deadliest conflicts in history—20 million lives lost. There are a lot of large death counts in this book. This is one of the largest, and it wasn't even racked up by leftists. Chinese communism would of course be responsible for anywhere from 35 million up to 100-plus million dead (most likely 50 million) since 1949 alone.[8]
- The Boxer Rebellion of 1899–1901, which reflected widespread discontent with foreign influence and the Qing Empire's inability to protect national sovereignty.

We could publish a ten-volume series on just these events and their ultimate consequences made manifest in the communist revolution that turned China red (in more ways than one). That said, we promised not a history book but historical insights, so we encourage you to do your own research if you are so curious. The past can be a great library you lose yourself in; we encourage you instead to make a lens of it for the present and the future: *What is likeliest to happen, based on patterns that have played themselves out previously?* In China, Spain, Russia, and elsewhere the unhumans have wielded power, those patterns have consistently included these OPE stages. Thus, we study China—just enough to understand how our times might emulate theirs and in what ways.

Prior to, during, and following China's internal rebellions, social unrest, and foreign wars, the little guy hurt the worst. In fact, even in China today, this is referred to as the Century of Humiliation. These have-nots were whom you'd probably expect for that period and place: farmers, manual laborers, unions, the military rank and file, radical intellectuals, students, bureaucrats. Yes, even the educated felt they didn't have enough. During the decline and fall of their empire, they were probably right.

Their enemies were of course the Qing dynasty, (mis)managing it all until 1911, various warlords, foreign business interests, and, characteristically, Christian missionaries, who were considered outsiders who hailed from prosperous yet dangerous adversaries—a threat to their ancient way of life.

If you know your history, Lenin's Comintern directed Dutch communist Henk Sneevliet to found a Chinese communist party, run by disgruntled, radical locals. The postimperial era brought a once-in-a-multi-millennia chance to replace one system with an entirely new one. The success of the Russian revolution offered a convenient template to follow. And so the Chinese Communist Party, the CCP, was founded in Shanghai in 1921 with thirteen inaugural members

— among them, Mao Zedong.[9]

And yet the CCP soon realized they needed to go their own way if communism would find lasting influence in China's future. In *The Rise and Fall of Communism*, Archie Brown writes that early Chinese communists realized their coalition of fed-up have-nots would not be the proletariat of Marxism-Leninism but the peasantry. "The strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must," wrote Thucydides in *History of the Peloponnesian War*. That famous quote from the Athenian historian perfectly describes the lot of the late-stage Qing dynasty peasant classes. Whether rural or urban, illiterate or industrialized, China's workforce of that period suffered all the consequences of war and rebellion and yet received none of the upsides (conflicts are always cash cows, to the privileged few). Wasn't it time for the peasantry to have a say in their own future? Wouldn't that just be … *fair*?

That said, Soviet allies of the early CCP thought this delineation unwise. Mao, who would soon emerge as the figurehead of Chinese communism, was encouraged *not* to organize the peasantry as his target group, those ones chosen to usher in red change. The Comintern preferred educated influencers to instigate uprising. To organize the peasantry was a Marxist heresy from their standpoint, preferring to organize leaders from the urban proletariat. Marx himself once described French farmers as "a bag of potatoes." In Mao's case, he initially attempted to bring the potatoes to the fight.

And that was that. The early CCP drew the line—if you profited from ways past, you were *oppressors*; if you suffered during that two-millennia status quo, you were *oppressed*.

Communist OPE, Stage 2: The Message

Once revolutionaries have identified and begun tracking who among the masses is most susceptible, the mass persuasion begins. The radicals create and distribute **messaging** crafted to cultivate maximum discontentment. Think of this tactic as "brand awareness" of the revolution. It's not yet a call to action in the advertising sense, i.e., "Buy now! Sign up here! Kill the landlords!" Rather, the Messaging Stage is to inform and enforce perception of and anger over the have-nots' lot in life—while assigning all blame to the perpetrating group(s), the haves.

The Messaging Stage is successful when the groups targeted for manipulation accept the oppressed frame. *You should have more. You don't. It's their fault. What are you going to do about it?* That question is left unanswered with specificity going into the third stage. That's by design. Let uncertainty fester. Let tensions escalate. Let envy build and resentment foment. Meanwhile, the unhumans begin their "long march through the institutions," or at least through the organizations they need in order to take the great leap forward, from the dividing to the conquering. Sometimes, that's more a short walk. Either way, that's Infiltration, Stage Three. Here's Step Two.

In pre-revolutionary Russia, the Bolsheviks under Lenin's leadership systematically built resentment among the working classes toward their rulers, effectively using persuasion like a viral contagion passed person-to-person, inflicting reminders of class division to foment hatred. They used grievances to inculcate power structures based on anger. (Remember, communists look for grievances to exploit for their own ends, and that includes offenses both real and imagined.)

Initially, the Bolsheviks framed the political narrative as a class struggle that could only end once the working class refused to put up with any further subjugation. This from Leon Trotsky was the gist of pre-revolutionary anti-Tsarist propaganda:

> Whatever the conditions may be the proletariat must clearly see its path and take it consciously. Above everything else it must be free from illusions. And the worst illusion in all its history from which the proletariat has up till now suffered has always been reliance upon others.[10]

In other words, *set yourself free*. This was a compelling pitch to the overworked underclasses of imperial Russia. So, too, for the military, as they had suffered a humiliating defeat in the first modern war—the Russo-Japanese War just after the turn of the century—and World War I seemed to serve no purpose for Russia beyond the glory of the Tsar and defense of his kingdom, an opportunity to rally all peoples of the empire into unified support of Nicholas II.

The Bolsheviks used all media available to them to spread their message of hope and change: newspapers, pamphlets, posters, cinema, and of course speeches and rallies. And they went where their audience was. That meant factories, military barracks, the urban squalor, and rural communities. *You have not, they have; here's what we're going to do about it*, was the consistent takeaway across all media and messages. Those paying attention couldn't *not* know where this was all going.

To widen their support base, the Bolsheviks got intersectional. They pledged self-determination to the diverse ethnic and national groups within the Russian empire, tapping into nationalist movements and discontent with imperial policies.[11, 12, 13, 14] And to win over women, the communists promised gender equality, challenging traditional roles and thus appealing to working women disillusioned with societal limitations (i.e., no civil rights equal to those of men), not those hallucinated in the twenty-first century by fourth-wave feminists.[15, 16]

This was when the socialists enacted International Women's Day, celebrated on March 8, the beginning of the Russian Revolution. Lenin and company also engaged the next generation, establishing youth organizations that encouraged young people to eschew traditional values and question the authority of their elders, fostering a generational divide that further fractured societal cohesion.[17, 18]

Lenin knew how to win. He knew who he needed to win. His backers needed him to win. And he played to win. Eventually, he would try to help Spanish leftists win, too.

In 1921, four years into Bolshevik rule in Russia, El Partido Comunista de España was founded in Spain. The Spanish Communist Party. They had broken off from the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party because, like the Mensheviks before them, they regarded violent revolution to be in poor taste. They would not join Lenin's Comintern. But the radicals of the party were willing to carbon-copy Bolshevism, so they split off, founded the Partido, and joined the Comintern separately.[19]

During his military rule from 1923 to 1930, Miguel Primo de Rivera suppressed the Spanish Communist Party by arresting its leaders. This kept its membership small and denied them the opportunity for mass protests, so they moved their activities abroad to France and worked with communist organizations in other countries. In France, they published manifestos and organized protests when Primo de Rivera visited Paris in 1926.

Obviously, open Bolshevik-like sentiment was unwelcome in Spain during de Rivera's rule. Radicals had to be covert if they were to continue any operation in Spain. And they did, with a little help from some friends. La Asociación de Amigos de la Unión Soviética was founded in the 1920s. Friends of the Soviet Union was a Comintern op. While its stated purpose was to develop interest in the Soviet Union, its real purpose was to develop relationships with locals

worldwide so that various Friends correspondents could place the propaganda the national headquarters of the Friends in the Soviet Union sent them and answered questions so that Soviet sympathizers were always well-informed. Propaganda included posters, newspaper articles, journals, art, movies, plays, music, and even travel to Russia. They even set up pen pals and had requests for matchmaking between citizens of Spain and Russia. Also, the Friends in the Soviet Union had a radio station broadcasting to Western Europe by the 1930s.[20] All this occurred beneath de Rivera's snout. Soon it would not need to.

By 1930, Miguel Primo de Rivera's popularity had dwindled to the point that the only honorable way out was resignation and exile—to, ironically, Paris, where he had forced his prior enemies the Spanish communists to seek refuge. Out of the chaos, the left-wing Second Spanish Republic emerged. The pendulum then swung the other way when conservatives took control of the national government following elections in 1933.

Prepping Spain for revolution in the Messaging Stage differed from that of Russia in both reach and publicity. Lenin and Trotsky gave open-air speeches at large rallies; communists in Spain had to hide one nation over or keep their work on the down-low at home. But the true believers kept the faith. Those who had an ear to hear communist propaganda heard and took it to heart.

Communists in China found eagerness and built trust with peasantry of course, but also with the next generation—including laborers, yes, but also the professional class. "The hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world," wrote poet William Ross Wallace. Communists then and now understand this. In postimperial China, the OPE was more than mere media messaging; it involved active recruiting. In *Finding Allies and Making Revolution*, Tony Saitch writes that the Socialist Youth Corps operated semi-openly, and Marxist Study Societies existed legally—the former, a recruiting pool for the CCP, and the latter, a legal way to disseminate Soviet propaganda in the new China.[21] These groups existed even prior to the founding of the party. Consider why.

At that time, the rural and urban youth of China alike had lived many lifetimes in their short one. Two thousand years had come and gone; it was the end of their history. The new government, under Sun Yat-sen and his Nationalist Party, advocated for three principles: nationalism (of course), democracy, and the livelihood of the people. Part and parcel with this came a struggle for the fate of the fallen empire's soul: *What is China to become now?* Over time, the Nationalist Party, particularly under Chiang Kai-shek, made clear that the livelihood of the Chinese meant open hostility toward communism. Democracy could coexist with no competitor. Chiang made that clear with a massacre of Shanghai communists in 1927. The communists would retaliate, of course, escalating a period of pre-revolutionary violence led by Mao Zedong aimed to trigger more peasant revolts by in part targeting one of their bitterest enemies—landlords. More on that shortly.

Note the contrast between the political right and left in China at that time. Nationalists offered order, conservative values, and a deep respect for tradition. But the early CCP offered young people belonging, sensemaking, and what we'll call "reading the room." Those youth corps and study groups surrounded likely radicals with people just like them—youngsters who wanted more for themselves, their class, and their nation. They also, through Soviet-inspired propaganda quietly distributed in meetings, quickly came to see China as the next country where a proletariat would necessarily defeat the bourgeoisie; the peasantry must rise up and overtake the powers that be. With the empire gone, that meant the Nationalists were chief among the enemies of change. Civil war would be the only recourse.

Until then, the CCP would speak to the hopes, dreams, pains, and fears of the young workers and students. Communists offered the vision of a "New China" free from oppression, where land was redistributed, rights were protected, and the country was industrialized and modernized. Messaging focused on the future, with readings and speeches and later with posters and films that depicted happy families, productive factories, and bountiful harvests under communism. The CCP "got" these kids in ways Nationalist sentiment did not.

We see absolutely no parallels with any of this in the modern-day USA. None at all.

Communist OPE, Stage 3: The Infiltration

Notice that what the dividing communists do *is* their conquering. Well, it's *almost* conquering. It is a pre-conquering. Communists cast a shadow over their target while its back is turned. Once they're cornered, it's (almost) too late to avoid fate.

If all unhumans had were "the people" on their side—that is, those groups they've been able to convince are oppressed by an oppressor class—they would not have a distinct advantage. They would, to borrow leftist language, be "punching up." Terror as a tool demands no way of escape. The monster is coming and the door is locked. So for the punch *up* to have the necessary impact for revolution, the unhumans must also punch *down*. They must wield actual power. To acquire it, they must **infiltrate**.

You see, instigators of the revolution need both individuals and institutions bought into the cause prior to the uprising. Think "inside men" and choke points together with sympathetic elites who stand to gain power, prestige, and profit from the upturning of society—from the squeezing of the middle by two iron fists.

Remember, operational preparation of the environment "shapes" the "human terrain." A leftist cliché is "power to the people." What that actually means in practice is *power to the people who want power*. And shaping the human terrain is how they get it. This is what they do.

In Russia, the Bolsheviks strategically infiltrated key social and political institutions, laying the groundwork for their eventual success in the 1917 revolution. They began by infiltrating "soviets," which were workers' and soldiers' councils (yes, that's the origin of the word), advocating for policies like direct worker control over production and Russia's immediate withdrawal from World War I. These positions, highlighting the immediate needs and desires of workers and soldiers, contrasted with the moderate stance of the Mensheviks.

The Bolsheviks' aggressive organization and propaganda efforts paid off as they gained significant influence within those soviets, particularly in crucial urban centers like Petrograd and Moscow. The All-Russian Congress of Soviets became a key arena for their activities, where they eventually secured a majority. This allowed them to claim legitimacy as the representatives of the workers and soldiers, bolstering their position in the eyes of the public.

With control over the soviets, the Bolsheviks established parallel authority structures to systematically undermine imperial institutions. They challenged the Orthodox Church by capitalizing on anticlerical sentiments, which further eroded the foundation of the old regime.

Controlling the narrative was crucial, so the Bolsheviks took over newspapers and other means of mass communication, using these platforms to deepen divisions and spread their revolutionary message. Everyone knows their flagship publication, *Pravda*. This control of information was instrumental in shaping public opinion and rallying support for their cause.

All this strategic positioning within key institutions culminated in the not one but two communist uprisings of 1917. In late winter early that year, Nicholas II abdicated on behalf of himself and his son. Then in October, with significant influence within the Petrograd Soviet and

control over critical military units, the Bolsheviks orchestrated a coup, overthrowing the new provisional government. They transferred power directly to the soviets and established a new government with Lenin in command.

OPE enabled this, all of this. And after seizing power, the Bolsheviks acted swiftly to consolidate their hold on the new order. They suppressed rival political factions, including the Mensheviks, shutting down their newspapers, arresting their leaders, and restricting soviet membership exclusively to Bolshevik supporters. These actions squashed any significant opposition, enabling the Bolsheviks to cement their control and begin transforming Russian society in their image and likeness. The Bolshevik rollup of power was so swift and complete because they had so well-prepared the environment for operation.

In Spain, the Infiltration Stage was well under way by the early 1930s, as the local communist party was formed more than a decade prior.

We pick up that story following the conservative, traditionalist electoral victory of 1933. Socialists and the have-not laborers for whom they advocated were big mad. So mad that mass strikes struck the nation. In October 1934, a miners' strike in the region of Asturias gave way to an armed uprising against the government. There and elsewhere, workers' councils were formed and socialist policies were enacted to create a sort of anarchy-meets-parallel-government. Unhumans do what they must under pressure. That pressure came from none other than Francisco Franco, military director of the Spanish army's General Staff at the time.

The clash between revolutionaries establishing fake laws and (dis)order, and the forces tasked with maintaining the previous ones would spill into the following years. In 1936, those covert connections made between Spanish communists and the Soviet Union would emerge as essential; the Soviets had been able to influence Spain through "cultural exchanges," more insidious because the Comintern managed to look so innocent while duping the Spanish people.[22]

In 1936, the socialist Popular Front achieved victory in elections that year, with Manuel Azaña the new prime minister. Then the emboldened leftists terrorized Catholics and landlords nationwide. When Franco stepped back up and said, in effect, *Not on my watch*, the Soviet Union met its match. Communist forces worldwide were mobilized to support Azaña and the varying shades of left in his coalition, from the mostly peaceful to the nunkillers. During the Spanish Civil War proper, the organizational and institutional forces of the Soviet Union and various communist parties worldwide aided and abetted their Spanish amigos.[23] The environment had been prepared.

China witnessed a more protracted period of Infiltration. The Comintern had gotten the Chinese Communist Party up and running, and they also held strong sway in the short-lived republican government of Sun Yat-Sen. Following the establishment of diplomatic relations between new China and the Soviet Union, the Russo-Chinese Information Bureau, beginning in the late 1920s, brought quiet Soviet influence into otherwise legitimate institutions. The Bureau was involved in cultural exchanges (naturally), propaganda efforts (of course), and possibly intelligence-sharing (!).

This was not the extent of communist-nationalist cooperation in postimperial China. Until the purging of Shanghai communists under Chiang, the CCP together with the Nationalist ruling party formed a "United Front"—the first one. Together, they opposed local warlord action and unified China. Fast-forwarding a bit, Mao's insurrection beginning in 1927 in response to Shanghai would not prove initially successful as envisioned. But with the invasion of China by imperial Japan in 1936, a temporary truce was called. Chiang's own generals detained him to

force him into the deal. A Second United Front between Nationalists and the CCP was formed. In the following years, including World War II, the communists fought two wars—a hot war against Japan and a cold one against their frenemy the Nationalists, expanding their influence across China and establishing CCP-allied guerrilla bases from which to operate openly against their own government when the time was right.

Communists cozy up to power, play nice as long as necessary, and backstab when and only when they have marked advantage. That was the case from 1945 through 1949. A world war had ended, and so would a regional one. Thanks to CCP OPE, it could only go one way.

There is an alternative path that Stage 3 can take, however, so it's worth bringing up—it is the dual power strategy. This refers to the coexistence of institutions of the old world and those upstart institutions of the new order. For a time, there is a coexistence of ever-weakening institutions opposed to the revolutions—think Tsarist Russia and its military, banking, property, and other systems—and those gaining strength, in this case the various Soviet councils. As loyalty to the old way dissolves and the energy of the new rises, the dying institutions have fewer and fewer means of enacting their will and maintaining their version of law and order. This is sometimes done directly by infiltrators of the institutions themselves, those revolutionaries who ensure the existing power structures align with the new ones to ensure maximum alignment with the cause. Either way, through infiltration or dual power play, the struggle is "fought" until it's actually fought—and by then it may be too late to fight back.

To Divide Is to Conquer

You can see from these three steps that repurposing standard military intelligence and special forces procedures—OPE—gives unhuman radicals strategic advantages. The greatest of these in our view is **organization**. One side is monolithically ready for the outbreak of total war and committed to absolute victory; the other may not even be in power, or is lost holding on to the old ways for dear life as what power they do have slips through their fingers.

Power chases persuasion; OPE creates it, and so the people follow. Pre-revolutionary activities work, but why exactly do they work? Why does "dividing" bring communists upward of 90 percent of the way toward "conquering"?

To understand why unhumans do what they do, understand their frame: anti-civilization. Their aim is to undo the humanity of those they deem guilty before charged. These ends justify any means. Anything and everything unhumans do is a derivative of the anti-civilization frame—from opposition to life, to opposition to liberty, to opposition to property. The hypothetical antisocialite isn't hypothetical. Communism is a super magnet for discontents and fringes—proletariat and peasant and anyone else who is a have-not and feels they ought to be a have-more. Perhaps they aren't losers because of their own failings. Perhaps they were oppressed. The objective of OPE then is to organize as many potential subversives (the followers) as possible under the direction of too-far-gone unhumans (their leaders). The unhumans have called the disaffected out of their situation, brought them into conscious and painful awareness of their lot in life, and then "other" those perceived to unfairly "have" at their continued expense. In short, effective OPE gives revolutionary leaders a powder keg of angry, bitter people. All they have to do is light it.

That's what they do next.

CHAPTER 4

THREE ACTS, THREE OUTCOMES: THE PLAN FOR REVOLUTION

Men at some time are masters of their fates.

—Gaius Julius Caesar

A communist revolution in Rome?

The late Roman republic (133–31 BC) is not often if ever considered a stage for class warfare to play out. In fact, the earliest conceptualization of what we know as "communism" today dates only to the year 1840. And yet the word itself derives from the Latin *communis*, meaning "shared" or "common."

One hundred years after the founding of Rome (753 BC), Greek philosopher Plato suggested in *The Republic* that the ruling classes of society could, to form an ideal state, "share the wealth," as modern leftists would say.[1] He argued, in a sense, that wealth meant both property and family —basically socialism and an early version of polyamory. We aren't suggesting Plato was a proto-communist, but he was at minimum directionally aligned.

If the seeds of social change had already germinated in Roman times, why then did that period bear no red fruit? Why no proto-communist revolution? Well, they came closer than you think. If you know anything about the Roman republic, you know the land was fertile. The first society *The Communist Manifesto* depicts as exhibiting class warfare is, interestingly, Rome. Throughout the republican period, the plebeians aired their grievances against the patricians. In those days, there was no middle class. To be a plebeian was to be a second-class citizen in a class of two. Plebeians were manual laborers, agricultural workers, even tradesmen and craftsmen and small business owners—a far cry from our day. The patricians were the elite, in every sense of the word. They had the rights. They owned the land. They called the shots. Dang, it feels good to be a patrician.

Not cool, to the plebeians. Change was coming. For two centuries, from 495 BC through 287 BC, there spanned the Struggle of the Orders. This was a protracted period of protests, strikes, and the very early granting of something we might call civil rights, to the plebeians. But of course, equality under the law even in theory is not equality of outcome. It never is. By the first

century BC, a four-hundred-plus-year-old republic was crumbling under itself, as republics are wont to do, the natural consequence of fiscal bloat, naked corruption, and overextension in foreign wars. We can't relate.

In the late Roman Republic, wealth disparity was extreme, with a small minority of elites controlling the majority of wealth and resources. The patrician class held vast estates, dominated political offices, and enjoyed luxuries beyond the imagination of the common people. Meanwhile, the majority of Romans, including plebeians and noncitizen residents, struggled to make ends meet, facing poverty, debt, and limited opportunities for advancement. The economic gap was so pronounced that it contributed to social unrest, political corruption, and ultimately the collapse of the Republic.

As we will see, vast income inequality and disparity always, always leads to unrest, which causes a government to either be forced into reform or face a revolution. The question of whether that revolt goes communist or populist depends on a variety of factors. Chief among them, is the rise of charismatic leaders committed to their cause, as we will see. But charisma isn't enough by itself to win a revolution.

Then and now, hard assets are the surest stores of wealth. In Rome, that wealth remained with the patrician class, landownership, specifically. This gave the unhumans of that age purchase to build their class resentment agitprop, as they always do, from Rome to France to Russia to Spain to China … to today.

To digress only slightly, in early Soviet Russia, the Bolsheviks claimed they wanted land reform for the landless working poor. Their specific targets were the kulaks (the upper middle class including small business owners). Yes, that was the plan: Take from the not-rich and give it to the poor. That didn't work out so well.

Prior to the Spanish Civil War, redistribution of land and collectivization occurred. The socialist republic of 1930s Spain aimed to break up large estates and redistribute them to landless peasants and laborers. In regions where radicals operated freely, there were efforts to promote collective ownership and management of land through agrarian collectives or cooperatives—pooling resources and labor to cultivate land collectively. Literal communism.

And throughout early to mid twentieth century China, communists also promised land reform for their peasantry. Mao Zedong did, in fact, deliver. Remember the Chinese peasant revolts we mentioned in the last chapter? In less than a decade, thousands of landowners were executed by Mao's mobs, although some estimates suggest the mass murder ran into the millions. The reason: disparate outcomes; 6 percent of the population owned 80 percent of the land, while 80 percent of the population owned only 20 percent of the land.[2] Enter, the struggle session.

During struggle sessions, communists would drag landowners from their homes, hurl all manner of accusations at them, sentence them to death, and shoot them. In other situations, humiliation and demoralization proved more useful than execution. From Mao's *Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan*, published in 1927, still the early days of the long march of communism across China, comes this report of the revolutionary "association" and their campaign against the landowning "gentry." This gets dark quick:

> A big crowd is rallied to demonstrate against a local tyrant or one of the evil gentry who is an enemy of the association. The demonstrators eat at the offender's house, slaughtering his pigs and consuming his grain as a matter of course. Quite a few such cases have occurred … After such demonstrations, the peasants usually impose fines. "Crowning" the landlords and parading them through the villages. [*sic*] This sort of thing

> is very common. A tall paper-hat is stuck on the head of one of the local tyrants or evil gentry, bearing the words "Local tyrant so-and-so" or "So-and-so of the evil gentry." He is led by a rope and escorted with big crowds in front and behind. Sometimes brass gongs are beaten and flags waved to attract people's attention. This form of punishment more than any other makes the local tyrants and evil gentry tremble. Anyone who has once been crowned with a tall paper-hat loses face altogether and can never again hold up his head. Hence many of the rich prefer being fined to wearing the tall hat. But wear it they must, if the peasants insist.[3]

Now, watch this: terror. It's the favorite tool of the unhuman, and it works.

> One ingenious township peasant association arrested an obnoxious member of the gentry and announced that he was to be crowned that very day. The man turned blue with fear. Then the association decided not to crown him that day. They argued that if he were crowned right away, he would become case-hardened and no longer afraid, and that it would be better to let him go home and crown him some other day. Not knowing when he would be crowned, the man was in daily suspense, unable to sit down or sleep at ease.[4]

The unhumanity of Chairman Mao will return in a later chapter. The point to be taken now is that the have-nots, be they in China or elsewhere, are a stiruppable lot. We see more parallels to this in the class conflict and corrupt leadership of late-republic Rome and eighteenth-century France. Rome could have devolved into a free-for-all like the French later would, and that seemed to be Rome's vector right around the year 50 BC.

And so we return to the question: Why didn't ancient Rome suffer a proto-communist revolution? Because one strong man said, *Not on my watch*, but he did so "in deeds not words," *in acta non verba*. That man was Caesar.

No previous book or documentary we're aware of has viewed ancient Rome through this lens of proto-communism. And the reason why, we believe, is that the fall of the Roman republic was not anything remotely like a left-wing success story. Rather, it offers a case study on how one great man of history may crush an uprising before it even occurs. And there are only three ways to do it—to defeat the unhumans. As we shall see, the case of Rome is two of them. So the end of that story will satisfy, let's rewind to the beginning—to the start of a communist revolution, of *any* communist revolution, and to the three "acts" the radicals' arc always follows. Then, we'll come full circle—to the three ways to defeat them.

Three Acts to Power: The Arc Every Revolution Follows

Karl Marx and Frederik Engels, authors of *The Communist Manifesto*, published in 1848, did not decide how the unhuman revolution unfolds. They merely documented it. As we've pointed out and will continue to, particularly when we fly to France in the next chapter (a revolution predating Marx and Engels by seventy-five years), violent left-wing radicalism predates modernity by centuries. For as long as there has been civilization, there have been forces opposed to it: the anti-civilizationists. Societies are built on law and order and always have been, even when they were constructed with mud, straw, sticks, and sheepskin. And for that long, there have been the lawless, the bitter, the nihilistic. And they've done what they must, as we've seen, to win the people—enough people—to their side. That's when they charge. Once that necessary

OPE work is done, this is what's next.

The Revolution, Act I: *Incite*

By this point in every revolutionary story, the house is divided against itself and so cannot stand. Deep battle lines have already been drawn, dividing oppressed from oppressor; have-nots from haves; *my life sucks* from *it's all your fault*. Envy has been advertised, with that message reinforced. Many souls have fallen to the unhuman state of pure hate. And their overlords of the coming rebellion, the instigators of it all, have the allies and access they need to possess hard and soft power.

And so it begins. *The Communist Manifesto*, famously referring to the have-nots as the proletariat class and the haves as the bourgeoisie, reveals:

> In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where that war breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.[5]

You caught that, didn't you? The part about "war" and "open revolution" and "violent overthrow"? The incitement is when the cause becomes conflict. When the glass is first broken, first shots fired, first bloodshed. It is the storming of the Bastille, to preview Chapter 5. The incitement is the unleashing of the unhumans, when first it occurs. It is always ugly. And it's almost always a surprise to those being unleashed upon.

By the way, democratic socialism with passive-aggressive action against the normal people, this is unacceptable to Marx and Engels. There is no revolution without violence. A revolution is not a dinner party, Mao said. Garden-variety socialists like the Mensheviks, they write, "wish to attain their ends by peaceful means" yet are "doomed to failure."[6]

And that's why they incite. Then they do this:

The Revolution, Act II: *Seize*

In the Second Act, the have-nots, after shock-and-terror violence unlike any their fellow citizens have ever borne witness to, shift from the first killing to prolonged robbing. They take your life, your liberty, and your property, in reverse order and in perverse ways (i.e., they steal your stuff, suspend your rights, then end your life).

These terrifying acts of seizure can take days such as in Russia, months as in Spain, or over decades as in China. The landlord-robbing account you read earlier occurred in the 1920s; Mao Zedong ruled the people of China into ruin until his death in 1976.

Marx and Engels include in the closing paragraphs of *The Communist Manifesto* this reminder regarding the second act:

> In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.
>
> In all these movements they bring to the front, as the leading question in each, the property question, no matter what its degree of development at the time.[7]

Translation: *The most important thing is we are going to take all your stuff.*

Earlier in the material, *The Communist Manifesto* is uncomfortably specific about the seizing that must occur for "justice" to be had. The complete and total robbing done by the unhumans includes:

- "Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes."
- "A heavy progressive or graduated income tax."
- "Abolition of all right of inheritance."
- "Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels."
- "Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly."
- "Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State."
- "Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste-lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan."[8]

No house, no land, no savings, no nest egg, no freedom. If the progressive platitude "You'll own nothing, and you'll be happy," had a plan, this would be it. But it gets worse, if you're a woman. Marx and Engels say elsewhere:

> The Communists … desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalised community of women.[9]

You know what a legalized community of women is, don't you? Following a successful communist revolution, men are to have sexual access to women at all times at no cost to themselves. That is, women become the sexual "community" property of men who have no responsibility to them or the children they father. But hey, at least the unhumans abolished so-called capitalist prostitution! (Tell us your movement is comprised of incels without telling us your movement is comprised of incels.)

As with all instigator promises to their followers, the Universal Basic Girlfriend guarantee is only fulfilled if you're in charge. Plot twist: The incels are not.

The Revolution, Act III: *Purge*

The Third Act is the literal removal of those labeled oppressors and all memory of them from the commons. This great purging has also been called (and has likewise involved) ethnic cleansing, forced displacement, genocide, famine, brainwashing, and, simply, massacre. Monuments are torn down, new ones built. Old heroes are written out of history, unhumans write of themselves as "on the right side" of it. The next generation must be made to forget what was lost—if a next generation of haves is even permitted to survive the purgings of Act Three.

The Cultural Revolution of China is an obvious example of a ruthless and thorough purging. From the landlords to the loyalists of any non-communist cause, to their spouses and children and extended family and even friends, all those who were not with the oppressed were now part of the oppressors. We'll cover the specifics of Chinese revolutionary terror in Chapter 8. For

now, understand that Mao did as his inspirations Marx and Engels advised. These excerpts from *The Communist Manifesto*:

- "The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being **sprung into the air**."[10]
- "The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, **overthrow** of the bourgeois supremacy, **conquest** of political power by the proletariat."[11]
- "**In place of** the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."[12]

We've bolded the essentials of purging. Before you reread and try to interpret what else is said in those excerpts, remember that we are not dealing with a coherent philosophy of subtle geniuses. The revolution is simply envy in action. And casting up and away, overthrowing, conquering, replacing … this is the language of cruel excision. The specifics are left up to the mob.

This the Third Act is not optional because the first two are not enough to the communist. In 1921, Vladimir Lenin famously said, "The whole question is—who will overtake whom?" Comrade Leon Trotsky shortened this to, "Who, whom?" Joseph Stalin ran with that and made it policy. So what does it mean?

"Who, whom?" means peaceful coexistence is impossible for the true believer. Either the haves will win, or the have-nots will, the unhumans believe, and victory must be total and unilateral. The only outcome is annihilation. Elimination. Purging.

Who will overtake whom?

Where from Here

Do you know how every communist revolution finally ends? The last line of the *Manifesto* is simply, "WORKING MEN OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!"[13] This is the call to action—a call to speed-run the Three Acts. Reading these and other writings of Marx, Engels, and other influential socialists of their day and after, you get the gist of their goal—to achieve something like "fairness," that is, a "fair share" being redistributed to the aggrieved groups out of the pockets, homes, and bank accounts of those deemed guilty of all that unfairness. Then and only then will there be utopia, according to the unhumans.

That doesn't happen. That's never what happens following a communist revolution. What does happen (every time) is the instigators of uprising enrich themselves at the expense of all. The purpose of a system is what it does, and this is the purpose of revolution: to rob and kill the normal people. There is no great realignment of society for the benefit of the many not the few.

As Will and Ariel Durant write in *The Lessons of History*, "Nothing is clearer in history than the adoption by successful rebels of the methods they were accustomed to condemn in the forces they deposed."[14] And so the plebeians, peasants, and working poor are *always* worse off after an unhuman revolution than before. An old elite has been cast aside to make way for the new, and any and all middle classes were hollowed out, their collective wealth sent upward, not down. This is what they do.

So, to review, the revolutionary's three-part playbook is to:

1. **Incite** violent conflict there is no coming back from.
2. **Seize** property rights, civil rights, and the right to life itself.
3. **Purge** the collectively guilty classes of people from society, living memory, and recorded history.

That's heavy. But there is hope. These things aren't inevitable.

Fighting Back: The Three Ways to Crush a Communist Uprising

We like civilization. We don't like anti-civilization. If you don't either, then you owe it to yourself to learn how to force-stop the destruction of all that you hold dear. History doesn't repeat, but it rhymes. And three defeats of communism echo to us down through the millennia.

How to Defeat the Unhumans: Let Them Eat Themselves

Imagine a snake. It's slithering about in search of prey. There in the grass alongside it, motion. A victim. *Strike*. And the snake eats itself. Its own tail, dinner.

The ancient Greeks knew that a predator suffering enough hunger could lose all instinct of self-preservation and devour its own flesh. This reality they embedded into the symbol of the *Ouroboros*—the snake that eats itself. You might have seen that symbol before. This explains it.

The unhumans are scavengers by their nature. Once all prey have been chewed and excised by tooth and claw or suspension of law, they have a choice: Go hungry, or keep eating.

You may have read or heard that the Soviet Union collapsed under its own weight. More so, the thing ate itself. When a society's haves are driven out, driven underground, or driven *into* the ground continuously and unceasingly as a matter of policy and on a long enough time scale, there is nothing left *to* be had. A command-and-control economy planned centrally by potbellied bureaucrats becomes a non-economy. Eventually, it dies and decays, and so begins the protracted period of bone-picking and marrow-slurping whatever's left. That was Russia and its former republics-turned-independents in the 1990s. Communism dies, but what lives on in its place isn't much of a living. The way Americans of the 1950s remembered the Great Depression and all the suffering and bitter sacrifices that period entailed, Russian nationals today remember the '90s.

Suffice it to say, the United States' Cold War policy to "contain" communism—designed and recommended by diplomat George F. Kennan—worked. Not perfectly, as we'll see Soviet influence the world over in upcoming chapters. But containment did make the red snake feast on itself. This outcome is acceptable if you are an observer. If you are party to the snake, not so much. (As an aside, the opposite is true in twenty-first-century geopolitics. It is Western globalists who are the expansionary, ideologically driven power, no longer the Communist Party of Russia or anywhere else.)

For the sake of all those who survive the communist revolution, we rate waiting it out as a less-than-ideal approach to defeat the unhumans. Yes, it can work. No, it's not pretty. Fortunately, we have options—the same ones Caesar took.

How to Defeat the Unhumans: Find the Great Men of History

If the first way to fight the forces of unhumanity is *nobody do anything*, the second way is *one person do everything*. That is the gist. It is Francisco Franco during the Spanish Civil War. It is

Gaius Julius Caesar in the turmoil of ancient Rome. Wrangel could have made it in Russia.

In Chapter 7, we'll see Franco crush the communists. Then in Chapter 13, we'll see what *anyone* can do to support, advise, or even become the one who says, as Franco did with steel resolve, "Wherever I am, there will be no communism."

How to Defeat the Unhumans: Win before Fighting

It would be nice if every uprising met its more-than-a-match in a strong man (or, yes, woman, we write as we recall the warrior-prophetess Deborah from the Bible). In most of our lives, there are no Hollywood moments. No nick-of-time rescue from an impossible situation with no way out. That's why there is despair. It's why many have-nots dream no more dreams. That's why there are revolutions.

In our present time, many otherwise good, smart citizens passively wait. We go to work, pay the bills, catch the game, keep up with the news, save for rainy days and maybe retirement (if not for student loans). Most of us don't worry about anything that's not on next week's schedule. After all, this is the age of the superhero action flick, where someone is coming to save us. What if there's not? What if you are destined to be a Tank Man—the otherwise unknown individual who stands before the literal armies of unhumanity, in eternal defiance? One man slowing down the tanks rolling into Tiananmen Square in 1989 didn't collapse communism. What if there had been one million Tank Men? That's a different story. Consider telling it.

We can do the work of saving ourselves—because we might not have another choice. This the third way may be the best way. We, the normal people, can band together, take united and decisive action, and nip revolution in the bud. **We** can win before fighting—as long as we understand that a fight *is* coming. This, too, is what Caesar did. He did not wait for the collapse. He crossed the Rubicon with his bros in tow.

Does this mean you need an army? Lock up the enemy? We are not suggesting lawless violence. We *are* suggesting to do what you can in the political realm —anything you can— before it's too late. Before the terror that paralyzes.

We'll bring you back to this moment of truth and path to victory in Chapter 13 to close out our time together, and with specifics. Leftists say that "real communism has never been tried," but the second and third ways to defeat **have** been tried and **work**.

Caesar chose himself. He and his allies restored order and brought glory to a fragile civilization and feckless government. He is why men today think about the Roman empire every day. Those who forget the past may be condemned to repeat it, but those who understand it are guaranteed to avenge it.

There is much more to spell out here that has been untold. Knowing it, even a little of it, will empower you to beat the revolutionaries at their own game. Victory means protection of everything that has been passed to us in society. Defeat is the end of everything you hold dear. It's humanity versus unhumanity. In the next few chapters, we'll give you a taste of how that battle has played out over the last 250 years.

CHAPTER 5

THE FRENCH TERROR: THE UNTOLD STORY OF THE COMMUNIST FRENCH REVOLUTION

The poor have done everything; it is time for the rich to take their turn.

—Jean-Paul Marat

You may know France today as a middling European power with a generous social safety net, lots of baguettes placed outside bakeries, high fashion, and a tendency for their leaders to commit adultery. But their leaders were still sleeping around back then—and more.

France in the 1700s was the most powerful country in continental Europe. They had the highest population, the most productive agriculture, a large and strong military, and a culture the envy of their peers. Everyone who mattered in the West learned French, for it was the language of international diplomacy and science, much like English is today. The American Founding Fathers knew French; Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson spent considerable time in Paris. Peter the Great and his aristocracy brought French culture to Russia. France was the epicenter of the Western world, and it had been that way for hundreds of years. Only for all of it to blow up in a five-year period. As it turns out, the French Revolution was a proto-communist revolution.

The French Revolution saw everything of the *ancien régime* thrown out and reduced to ashes —religion, social codes, the nobility, all of it. Many of the ideas that took root then are ones we're still dealing with now. Indeed, the very terms "left-wing" and "right-wing" that we all still use today came precisely from France's National Assembly early in the Revolution, where social revolutionaries sat to the left and traditionalist monarchists sat to the right.

Before the Bastille

The French Revolution was not inspired by the American Revolution despite the two happening only a few years apart and despite the relationship between the American Founding Fathers and French elite friendly to the cause. But like the American Revolution, the actions of Great Britain set the French on the course to revolt, though not to the same degree. By the waning decades of

the eighteenth century, France was losing its percentage of global empire-share to Britain. France lost the Seven Years' War to Britain—what we call the French and Indian War in America—as well as several colonial possessions. England's mercantile strength had risen as well, to the point they had the beginnings of their global maritime commercial empire they would become famous for in the nineteenth century. Meanwhile, France, while still strong, had begun its downward trend.

But the deepest roots of the eventual revolution were internal to France. The Enlightenment, an intellectual current that upended Europe's traditional deference to the Church, its traditions, and the culture it gave rise to, came to fruition in the eighteenth century— and it drove many American revolutionary values. Names such as Montesquieu, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and the like came out of this period.[1] And yet despite the progress, the French government was considered a relic. In their absolute monarchy, the king held near-total power over the country and the fate of all inhabitants. Most authority was centralized around him and his court. Even so, the current French monarchy wasn't some age-old tradition that stretched back to the Middle Ages. It was a more recent political idea, a response to the traumas of the Protestant Reformation and the subsequent warfare it brought upon the Catholic world. How do you strengthen a weakened state? You give it a strong leader. For Catholic France, this was the Bourbon monarchy.

Not two centuries into the modern king thing, the bill came due. This is literal; the French monarchy had borrowed too much money and couldn't pay.[2] (Keep in mind that there is no law of economics or physics that prevents this from happening in modern times, for those of you keeping score at home.)

Due to the economic crunch, King Louis XVI needed help and a plan from parliament, known as the Estates-General. But there was one problem: They hadn't met in more than 150 years. The king now needed a parliament, as that body had previously held authority over taxation. This would also conveniently shift the blame for the tax hike off the king. Louis XVI hoped higher taxes would cover his empire's mounting debts. The king's officials spent several months visiting France's various regions, all mostly rural, and delegates for the Estates-General were chosen. Louis XVI also asked his subjects across France to submit their grievances to the Estates-General; we forget how inconvenient basic surveys were in the age before instant social media polling and online reviews.

Well, the one-star reviews came fast and loose. If there's one thing the French love above all else, it's criticism. The French complained about paying too many taxes already. Too many old feudal duties remained. The Church held too much power and had been corrupted. Louis XVI realized there would be no new taxation without an official response to these grievances. So he began conceding to the demands of his people. This was the first sign of trouble. We'll explain why.

The Estates-General was a parliament divided into three bodies: the First Estate (the clergy), the Second Estate (the nobility), and the Third Estate (the people). And because the Third Estate was so vast, they felt they were the true representatives of France, not the aristocrats or the Church. A classic have-nots versus haves situation. Because the Third Estate represented the common folk, Louis XVI decided (unwisely) to exclude them from proceedings. Nowadays, we might call this an "own goal." The commoners of parliament didn't respond well. Louis XVI completed the radicals' Separation Stage for them.

And so the Third Estate, fired up now, met separately and privately at an abandoned tennis court and swore they would not disperse until they had established a constitution for France—the

"Tennis Court Oath."[3] Consider the timing: The United States constitution was being written during this very period, and the everyday people of France were not about to be left out.

The ideas proposed during Third Estate constitutional debate were not entirely radical, at first, as they never are. For example, turning the nobility into an honorific title with no special authority was already on the table; Louis XVI might have even accepted that change. But dreams of egalitarianism can fast become nightmares of vengeance. The Third Estate flexed their proletariat might; they announced the formation of a National Assembly, asserting popular sovereignty over and above the divine right of kings. This was in effect the message of this upstart institution: *We alone are the true voice of France*. *Vox Populi.* The environment for uprising was well-prepared.

Supporters of the National Assembly struck first. At that time in France, there was no greater symbol of monarchist tyranny than the Bastille, an already ancient prison. Numerous would-be instigators of uprisings against the king had disappeared behind its castle walls over the previous decades, never to be seen or heard from again. Although the prison was not in nearly as much use—the Bastille held fewer than ten prisoners at that time—seizing the king's private prison won the revolutionaries great symbolic value.[4] Victory would also give the radicals gunpowder, arms, and ammunition.

On July 14, 1789, a fiery but mostly peaceful protest began (like the United States in 2020). The mob breached the gates and butchered the officer in charge. And so the French Revolution had begun. The morale of the people was never higher; the government's ability to restore order, never weaker. Historians argue over who, exactly, was in charge of the mob as word of the Bastille's fate spread; mob became *mobs*, and soon all French cities had them. We'd argue the rioters then and there (or here) needed no direction. This was an army densely ranked and filled with have-nots who, as in twentieth-century Russia, had legitimate grievances with the old feudal ways. But the prudence of America's Founding Fathers was nowhere to be seen in mainland Europe. France fell into a state of unhumanity due to those who overran it. They had no plan or policy, but what they did have was the greatest advantage the unhuman could ever lust after: organization. A lot of people were angry, they came together, and they shared one common goal. Two, actually: Rob, and kill.

Now, what was the response to all this? Well, the great irony is that King Louis XVI was not the brutal, iron-fisted tyrant depicted in popular culture. He was a weak figurehead of his own government. He lacked the will to his own power, content to coast on legacy. His brother urged him to either flee the country along with other nobles, or crack down. Marie Antoinette as well, was not some obstinate socialite. In fact, she gave greatly to philanthropic endeavors and founded charity houses all over France. There is no evidence whatsoever that she ever said, "Let them eat cake," but the fact you associate it with her is a perfect example of the power of communist messaging operations.[5] Even two hundred years later, everyone knows this (false) quote of hers.

As the revolution continued, the most organized of the unhumans made themselves into little dictators in ground zero of the uprising: Paris. The king did nothing. It would be two years before he did *something*. And that was to try to escape to a loyalist region of France, in 1791. Totally and completely botched. King Louis lacked the organization of his adversaries. He and wife Marie Antoinette and their children were caught and detained by revolutionaries, then sent back to Paris and placed under strict surveillance. Just about anyone in the country who still respected the king as the authority lost it once news of his capture spread. They, too, fled if they could.

Let's take a brief aside to consider the thoroughly European context of the French Revolution by 1791. Although the American Revolution is considered the most modern sociopolitical revolution, its leaders did not aim to overturn British society; the American Revolutionary War was a conflict over the colonies. It was elites against elites, haves versus haves. A war was simply fought over who got more. (Also coming to mind are the 1916 Easter Rising of the Irish against their British colonizers, the ensuing civil war led by Michael Collins, Irish independence in 1921, and the founding of the republic of Éire. This, too, was a revolution, but as in North America, the goal was not to invade or overrun Britain with communism but rather boot the Brits out. Not communism.)

War with Britain's colonies across the pond was not the first revolution that eighteenth-century Europe history had witnessed. America was thus not seen as a template to necessarily follow, as some might assume. Just two years prior to the French Revolution, the Dutch had undergone their own revolution, which gave way to a new republic. In the previous century, the English had waged a bitter civil war that greatly increased the power of parliament while weakening the monarchy forever after. Intellectuals privy to the goings-on in France anticipated an unfolding of events similar perhaps to the Dutch but more likely to the English Civil War, with a monarchy restored alongside a quasi-republican government as a parliamentary companion to check and balance.

But that did not happen. Rumors spread throughout the French countryside that old King Louis had dispatched the army to attack and subdue the peasantry—and that the nobility had his back. The have-nots preempted; all over France, mobs broke into the nobles' manors and murdered whole families where they slept. Terror.

The revolutionaries also sought to erase the past and restart the nation anew. They destroyed records related to feudal obligations, such as tax records, labor conscription, and anything else that had caused the peasantry hardship. And still, in the midst of all the murder and mayhem, first in the cities and now in the country, there was no response from the monarchy, the military, or the nobility. Modern leftists like to say, "Silence is violence." This is true but not in the way moderns intend it. In the French Revolution and beyond, the silence of those who should be responsible for preventing and ending violence only begets more such violence. Total inaction by the French government allowed the revolutionaries total freedom of action; thus, the most radical, embittered, and cynical of the bunch set the tone. French revolutionary leaders ran a purity test of sorts on all in their midst to see how committed to the cause they were. This culminated in the extremist Jacobins putting everyone not revolutionary enough to the guillotine. It's Bolsheviks and Mensheviks all over again for the first time. (More on the Jacobins shortly.)

Just as the revolutionary movement was hostile to the nobility, they also targeted the culturally and politically dominant Catholic Church. Monasteries were shuttered and their residents turned out based on the assumption that these servants of their faith sat on great wealth but performed no valuable work. *You have more money than I do; obviously you should give it to me*, thought the rebelling peasants. Entire classes were told they were justified to think this way, then and now. Oppressors and oppressed, oppressors and oppressed, all the way down until the bitter end. This is what they do.

Churches were forced to close. Priests and nuns were arrested, sometimes executed on site. Any and all surviving clergy were required to recite loyalty oaths to the new French republic declared by the radical-run National Assembly. Christianity had been officially replaced with an Enlightenment cult of science.

In 1793, amid the fervor of anti-religious sentiment and the fevered push for secularism, the

world-renowned Cathedral of Notre Dame was desecrated and sacked. Its religious artifacts, statues, and stained glass windows were smashed. The cathedral was converted into the "Temple of Reason," symbolizing the rejection of the Catholic Church's spiritual and philosophical authority. Christian religious symbols were destroyed or defaced, and the cathedral's interior was rearranged to accommodate new revolutionary ceremonies. This period of desecration marked a profound shift in the cultural and religious landscape of France, reflecting the revolutionary ideals of liberty, equality, and secularism.

The Jacobins, the most radical of revolutionaries, met in one of the abbeys confiscated during the initial Catholic purge. They agreed to turn every aspect of French society upside-down, seeking a "Year Zero" in which all prior historical knowledge and ideas were to be discarded and disavowed in favor of the revolutionary ideology. Out of all the factions active during the French Revolution, they pushed the hardest for rapid change, winning over many other factions to their way of thinking and doing, i.e., robbing and killing at will.

This Year Zero business is not an exaggeration—the revolutionaries devised a new calendar based on a ten-day week with three weeks to a month, ten months total, with a few extra days tacked on at the end. The new month's names would be made up, sharing no prior links to any previous Western history.[6] This was to be a new era, free of old superstitions and customs.

To force all of France to accept this extent of radical change, the Jacobins had to apply pressure—and they did, to Louis XVI.

Under Pressure, Under the Guillotine

The French Revolution was not born out of a desire to remove the monarchy by force, even if that is what indeed happened. Many Frenchmen and women would initially voice loyalty to the monarch, but they did so in an odd way. At the beginning of uprising, loyalists of all classes pilgrimaged to the royal palace of Versailles, stood vigil outside, and proclaimed their love for the king. He failed to reward these early supporters. Soon he would have none of consequence. His timidity gave the revolutionary demands legitimacy. This is why we do not speak of a "French Civil War." The opposition did not fight back. And so the escalation continued.

Desecration didn't end in the cathedrals with statues destroyed and windows shattered; with revolutionaries, it never does. Mobs also paid a visit to the tombs of the old French kings outside Paris, tore everything down and out, and scattered bones and corpses everywhere. Unhumans have to cut their mark into society. All symbols of the past must go, no matter how precious or revered.

How could any of this wanton destruction be classed as "reason"? It was an arrogant belief among the revolutionaries that they were the only party who had embraced the Enlightenment; anyone caught voicing anything less than revolutionary zeal was condemned as an enemy of reason. Their logic was as follows: Tradition is not reasonable. It makes no sense for the people of France to do things simply because they've done them that way for hundreds of years, from paying taxes to the king, to praying to the same God he did in houses of worship his family had funded generations prior. To clear out the accumulated social and intellectual mold, you kill everything. You destroy it all. You throw out the old religion, the old norms, the old calendar. The Jacobins accepted an early iteration of Blank Slate Theory, typical of communists in the twentieth century and progressives of our own day. According to this Theory, humanity is deemed perfectable; it is possible to shape a man, woman, or they/them like clay into the image of your desiring. So, too, is it believed possible to rework society as a whole from first principles untainted by the decrepit customs of the past that allowed this present crisis. *If the tradition you*

followed brought you to this, of what use was the tradition?

Change from scratch must be total and complete. Everything has to go. In France, even mainstays like the right to an appeal were ripped out of the legal system. The revolutionaries swept aside the old organizational system of the country, replacing the medieval system of provinces with "departments," which France has to this day.

Our point is that what was considered radical and extreme early in the revolution became mainstream and institutionalized in a few short years. The original plan of the Third Estate was to retain Louis XVI as constitutional monarch, similar to the English way, but that would not satiate the majority Jacobins. So they not only deposed him, they put him on trial as "Louis Capet," a mere citizen of France, stripped of exalted status, together with his wife Marie Antoinette. The revolutionaries voted to lop their heads off and did so with pleasure and great fanfare. The monarchy was then declared a criminal institution. To have aided and abetted it previously was treason to the new republic, to be traitors against France itself.

With a solemn procession through Paris, the king ascended the scaffold, as thousands gathered to watch the spectacle. They cheered. With the sickening thud of the blade, the reign of the Bourbon monarchy was severed like a thread, recoiling into the annals of history.

Henry Edgeworth, King Louis's priest, wrote that his last words were as follows:

> I die innocent of all the crimes laid to my charge; I pardon those who have occasioned my death; and I pray to God that the blood you are going to shed may never be visited on France.[7]

Following her husband's grisly fate, Marie Antoinette faced her own moment of terror. Clad in a simple gown, her once-breathtaking beauty diminished by her time spent locked up, she ascended the scaffold with grace, by all accounts. She refused to struggle or cry out, even as the blade fell. Her only crime was to have married a king.

Mobs broke into the prisons where various aristocrats and royal sympathizers were held. They either slaughtered them outright in their cells or dragged them out to the nearest guillotine. This new legal system reflected an outright presumption of guilt. France had fallen from ponderous debates about the fate of the king, to ten-minute show trials where the only evidence needed to condemn you to death was that someone had accused you of once saying something good about Louis XVI. Perhaps the accuser fancied your spouse and coveted your stuff. Pure coincidence, we're sure.

The revolutionaries were at this point executing dozens of citizens per day. The first to be guillotined were the royal family, the nobles, the clergy, and all who had openly supported them. Up next were conservatives and moderates who preferred not to have blood in the streets. Death sentences went on and on until only the true believers remained. All other voices were silenced with violence or the threat of it.

But France is not an island. Word of the bloodshed spread to the neighbors. Other European powers, fearing chaos and carnage might spread to their domains, took action. Prussia, for example, declared war on the new French republic, determined to help rebuild the royal institution as a way of safeguarding their own. But they were not prepared for a gentleman's war with forces who no longer lived like men. And so mobilization turned into retreat, giving the inhumans even more momentum now.

The Revolution Finally Eats Itself

"The Reign of Terror" is what we now call that period of barely state-sanctioned mass murder. Its ruler was the hideously ugly Maximilien Robespierre, perhaps the most repugnant unhuman to wield power in all of French history. Month after month, he personally ordered hundreds and hundreds more dead.

The Terror came to a head with the execution of sixteen Carmelite nuns of Compiègne. Accused of harboring loyalty to the monarchy and practicing counterrevolutionary activities (i.e., refusing to break their religious oaths), these devout women were hauled into Paris to face the judgment of the revolutionary tribunal. On the day they were sentenced to die by guillotine, the streets surrounding the Place de la Révolution echoed with the clamor of a restless crowd hungry for bloody spectacle.

Led forth in a solemn procession, the Carmelite sisters, imminently to become martyrs, clad in simple robes, met their fate with divine resolve. Their faces, etched with the lines of devotion and suffering, betrayed neither fear nor despair but rather showed a profound serenity born of faith. As they ascended the scaffold one by one, a hush fell over the crowd, punctuated only by the commands of the executioner. With each of the sixteen thuds of the blade, a ripple of shock reverberated through the onlookers, mingling with the haunting hymns of the condemned women, who never stopped singing until the unhumans silenced them to the last. In their final moments, the Carmelite nuns embraced martyrdom with a grace that transcended mortal anguish, their unwavering faith a beacon of hope amid the darkness of revolution.[8]

The nuns did not die in vain. Jacobins in attendance, realizing they were not as gleeful over the shedding of innocent bled as Robespierre was, knew their turn at the 'tine might be next. And so Robespierre was soon thereafter framed for corruption and summarily executed himself, just ten days after the martyrdom of the Carmelites. All's fair in hate and war.

Robespierre's fate befell several of the most bloodthirsty revolutionaries, many of whom were likewise dragged to the guillotine, only screaming and crying famously—unlike the pious Louis, Marie, and the nuns, who led themselves calmly into death with tremendous dignity.

When studying this the bloodiest period of the French Revolution, we come away with two conclusions: These people were evil, and they got what they deserved in the end. The many Jacobins who'd called for wanton murder and butchery were themselves eventually slaughtered, treated with the same contempt and cruelty they'd shown others.

The final death count reached upward into the many tens of thousands; someone had to do something. That someone was Napoleon Bonaparte, and that something was to restore law and order.

The Legacy of the Communist French Revolutions

Despite the excesses of the Revolution, despite the needless murder and destruction, despite the unnecessary attacks on everything that came before, many revolutionary changes were popular. Perhaps we should have said "because of" rather than "despite." After all, old feudal obligations were done with, flattening out French society so that the haves had become the have-nots (as in, have not their own lives). Positions of authority were conveniently opened up across society. Many shut out of the old regime's institutions now had a chance to climb to the top. Regardless of all the damage the Revolution did and the bitter suffering it caused, there were changes it enacted that were long overdue. Remember, revolutionaries seek to empower those with a set of grievances, real or invented. In royal France, they were largely real.

One could defend the French Revolution on the idea that it brought about much-needed social

change. However, one could also argue that Britain managed to do this without an orgy of death. And of course, the United States created lasting change without a Reign of Terror. And in both England and America, the ideals and application of the Enlightenment—such as liberty and technology, respectively—found a home in both countries without vindictive campaigns of escalating brutality. America has its constitution, which provides an orderly way to make changes to government. Britain retains its monarchy, with a reduced level of authority. So naturally, we come away from the French Revolution realizing all the bloodshed accompanying it was unnecessary. The ends failed to justify the means. Indeed, the French themselves came to this conclusion—that's why Napoleon soared in popularity. In 1795, Napoleon put down an attempted insurrection against the republic with what was called "a whiff of grapeshot" and is credited as ending the revolution.

A few years later, in 1799, Napoleon launched a bloodless coup against the weak republic itself. He appointed himself First Consul and dissolved that disastrous revolutionary government. Within a few years, he was declared Emperor of France and crowned in the restored Cathedral of Notre Dame. He returned the Catholic Church to public life, albeit without any say in government. No more shooting priests in the head, no more beheading nuns, no more burning churches down. The Church could be a part of French life again. This one move to let the French be Catholic again moderated any remaining revolutionary fervor. Napoleon famously remarked, "I found the crown of France lying in the gutter and picked it up with my sword." Those French who had fled under Louis XVI felt safe to return. Napoleon formulated a civil code that remains the basis for French law today. The departments stayed; no bringing back the old provinces. Feudalism stayed dead. The story of Napoleon, of course, continued beyond this, but that is a topic covered in many other books.

Years after the Napoleonic era, France once again attempted a monarchy. It did not go well. The novel and musical *Les Misérables* depict one of the failed French uprisings, that one in 1833. In 1848, unemployed and underemployed have-nots once again revolted—this one called the June Days Uprising—shortly after the arrival after the French-language version of the *Communist Manifesto*. Thousands died. Taxation was reformed. Civil rights were granted. Executive power was limited. Eventual peace didn't last. Napoleon's nephew declared himself emperor three years later.

Communist Manifesto coauthor Frederick Engels would lament of the 1848 French insurrection that "neither the economic progress of the country nor the intellectual development of the mass of French workers had as yet reached the stage which would have made a social reconstruction possible."[9] Real communism had not been tried. It was about to be in, you guessed it, France.

In the immediate aftermath of defeat in war with Prussia in 1871, the hardened working-class defenders of Paris seized control of the city. Radicals and revolutionaries among their ranks murdered two French generals in command and announced the Paris Commune—a new revolutionary government, with its flag blood-red—the first association of the color with communism. Karl Marx wrote *The Civil War in France* just as the communists were overrun and defeated by the French army and their leaders executed. This *was* the first real-world implementation of communism; Marx wrote of it fondly:

> Working men's Paris, with its Commune, will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators, history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all of

the prayers of their priest will not avail to redeem them.[10]

George Kennan–style containment plus immediate bud-nipping ended this particular French revolution before it could take hold. Ideas were prohibited from infecting disgruntled soldiers and laborers elsewhere at that time in France, and the full force of law and immediate restoration of order killed the Paris commune, with no chance of survival or revival.

Elsewhere in the French revolutionary universe, that had not been the case. Amid the collapse of the French monarchy and the National Assembly's declaration of a new republic, all was not well in the colonial world. You probably know about Haiti, how there was a slave uprising concurrent with the French Revolution, and how they ultimately won. Or is that what actually happened?

Let's turn back a few pages into French revolutionary history and see.

Dishonorable Mention: Communist Revolution in Haiti

As an aside, we would be remiss if we did not mention a certain island nation not far at all from America's shores that owes its identity to what happened in Paris in the 1790s. You might call Haiti an offshoot of the French Revolution shared cinematic universe. By the time of the revolution, Haiti had been one of France's chief holdings in the New World, and as like other Caribbean nations, it had been stocked with slaves from West Africa.

In 1790, the new revolutionary French republic committed to righting all perceived historical wrongs in society. Liberation to the oppressed! Death to the oppressors! We'll hear these refrains over and over, so get used to them. We mentioned a select few already, such as the ruling rights of aristocrats versus the everyday man and woman. Another issue the revolutionary republic decided to tackle was the representation of free blacks in the National Assembly, specifically those on the Caribbean island Hispaniola in the colony of Saint-Domingue (now known as Haiti). Half the island was ruled by France, the other half by Spain. The main advocate for his people was Vincent Ogé, a mulatto Creole and well-to-do slaveholder. His class was known as *affranchis* (freed people of color), and Ogé fought for wealthy *affranchis* citizenship in the new France—and won it. But upon his return to Saint-Domingue and announcement of the news, things did not go well for him. Colonial leadership on the island refused to acknowledge the National Assembly's new biracial citizenship law, Ogé took up arms against the colonists, and he was captured by Spanish colonists from the other side of the island, ruled by Spain (now known as the Dominican Republic). He was summarily tortured to death before an audience of his enemies. Things really did not go well after that. This was 1791.

The spirit of revolution passed from Ogé to all *affranchis*. Within two months of the execution, there was open warfare between the *affranchis* and French authorities. Thousands of slaves soon joined them. Anarchy overtook the western (French) half of the island. Enraged mobs of sword-wielding, gun-toting blacks, both slave and free, swarmed colonial plantations and properties. One of the few eyewitness accounts from the uprising is that of an anonymous director of the Clément plantation. His barking dog awoke him suddenly on the night of August 22, 1791. This individual, a white European, ducked under his bed as gunfire blasted through windows and walls. He heard voices calling out.

"Who is it?" he asked.

"It is death!" answered the mob. "Kill, kill," they added. They then killed everyone else in the building before looting the place. The director was eventually found but spared by a wild

leader of the revolt, ex-slave Dutty Boukman, who spared the plantation director's life because he had once treated him kindly, like an equal.

But the director's living nightmare would continue, as he joined the rebels on a forced march to commit further atrocities. The anonymous man sensed regret and remorse set in his captors that very night. But Boukman ordered them onward with a threat: *Keep going, or *I* will shoot *you.*[11]

Unhumans. This is what they do.

Large and warrior-like, former slave Dutty Boukman, who had been born in West Africa, kicked off that bloody slave revolt with a ceremony of animal sacrifice that blended Islamic teaching and voodoo practices. Haiti would become synonymous with voodoo occult rituals, and Boukman was a top practitioner who led the rites. To the assembled crowd he passed around a cup of animal blood which everyone drank, and he called out, "The God of the whites pushes them to crime, but he wants us to do good deeds. But the God who is so good orders us to vengeance. He will direct our hands, and give us help. Throw away the image of the God of the whites who thirsts for our tears. Listen to the liberty that speaks in all our hearts."[12]

Then the blood massacres began—including the one that the anonymous eyewitness related to us. Most weren't so fortunate. Men, women, and so many screaming children, it didn't matter. If you were French, you were hacked to death.

The authorities would eventually catch up to the murderers marauding the plantations and put them to justice. Boukman was captured and beheaded by the French, his decapitated head placed on public display. And that plantation manager fled for France to tell his tale.[13] But Boukman would become a symbol of resistance and vengeance to the Haitian slaves; he remains a galvanizing symbol of national pride in Haiti today.

This was not the end of revolution in Haiti; it was the end of the beginning. In 1792, a new French law granting citizenship to all *affranchis* regardless of wealth or social status failed to return any semblance of peace. Other radicals would raise up armies of the aggrieved as well, men known to history such as Toussaint Louverture and Jean-Jacques Dessalines. Both were former slaves who'd joined the rebellion following the death of Vincent Ogé. Agents of the new French republic were sent to stabilize society in 1793, with all slavery being outlawed in 1794. Louverture and Dessalines had been made the lowest of their society, the have-the-least of all the have-nots. And yet neither brought law, order, or justice. Communist leaders throughout promise their followers the world, then take it from them. This is what both men did, in succession. The French initially supported Louverture, who'd raised up a vengeance-seeking army. He declared himself "governor-general for life" amid a military dictatorship over the entire colony. Former slaves were forced back to work on former slave plantations. This is what they do.

In 1801, Napoleon Bonaparte dispatched French forces that included both white and *affranchis* officers and soldiers to relieve Louverture of his duties. He died imprisoned in France in 1803; Louverture met the fate he'd forced upon his own free countrymen.[14]

Then it got worse. Jean-Jacques Dessalines, a former lieutenant of Louverture, re-revolted against the French. Multiple factors including a yellow fever epidemic, British naval involvement, and the sale of Louisiana to the United States gave Dessalines and his forces a broken window of opportunity. Dessalines believed his comrade Louverture had not gone far enough.

Following victory over the weakened French, Dessalines re-reinstituted the plantation system, forcing fellow blacks to once again return to forced work, and in 1804 crowned himself the first emperor of a new independent nation: Haiti. Besides the brutish treatment toward his

own people, his regime outlawed ownership of any and all property by white people. He then extended his racist campaign and ordered the systematic murder of all whites in Haiti. Thousands of white men, women, and children were massacred all over Haiti. This white genocide made the situation for Haitian blacks no better. His own people revolted against him, and Dessalines was killed in an attempt to suppress a rebellion against him.[15]

And that has been the history of Haiti ever since: robbing and killing. A country founded on unhuman revolts ends in chaos and cannibal warlords. The former French colony of Hispaniola was founded on the oppressor-oppressed story brought to life in a bloody slave revolt and gave its people the worst standard of living in the entire Western hemisphere: Haiti.[16] The Spanish side maintained its integrity, repelled multiple invasions from Haiti over the next century, and was named at the time of this writing the happiest people on earth: the Dominican Republic.[17] Unhumanity versus humanity. The results speak for themselves.

Note that the black Haitian dictators still reinstituted chattel slavery after France had ended it, even over their fellow blacks, once all the whites had been massacred. They brought totalitarian rule and speed-ran massacres in all territory under their control. It's almost like that was their goal in the first place. As everyone knows, Haiti never became a utopia. And yet, it shares the same island as an actual tropical utopian paradise in the DR. The difference is everything. The difference is unhumans. Boukman's vengeance is still being felt today in Haiti.

A communist revolution is, with irony, promised to be of the people, by the people, for the people. And it never is. The objective is never equality; it's power. The unhumans know how to seize it. They find the have-nots with grievances, legitimate or imagined, and emotionally abuse them. They rile them up. And then, they unhuman them. The radicals turn men into beasts, people into predators, with no will but to kill. *Is it death! Kill, kill*. Then when it's done, those who did not die in the uprising suffer a regret that is a living prison their conscience can never escape. All while the leader of the rebellion wins absolute power, power that in most cases exceeds that of the original accused oppressor individual or class. And they leave the place worse off than they found it. This is what they do.

We have to be very clear about this. France was already ending slavery and had begun the process of granting citizenship to the freed slaves *before* the massacres began. It's almost as if it was never about equality at all. It never is.

Now, this abridged history of the French Terror, full revolutionary period, and its legacy probably felt unsettlingly familiar. Let's talk about that.

The Revolution Is Now

The parallels between late eighteenth-century France and our time are almost so obvious we shan't name them. We shall.

Let's go back to the beginning, to the preparation of the environment for revolution. For one, the United States is dealing with our own rising foreign rival—Britain then, China now. The United States is running up a laughably unsustainable national debt. Just as France and its language were the intellectual trendsetters of Europe, America and the English language decide global culture today. Just as eighteenth-century France hadn't convened an Estates-General in 150-plus years, the US hasn't convened a Constitutional Convention since the original constitution was ratified, more than two centuries ago. If a Constitutional Convention were convened today, we expect a collapse into chaos like that of the Estates-General and National Assembly. A total rewrite of the American political and legal system would likely follow.

As economic and social crises come to a head in modern-day USA, radical ideologies take center stage. The political unrest of 2020 was a sort of micro-French and/or Haitian Revolution. While the mobs didn't succeed in overturning the federal system (though it did unseat President Donald J. Trump in a highly dubious election result) or killing all white people (though many black mobs went hunting for them), we did witness an eerily similar desecration of revered symbols of the past, the storming of police stations, the tearing down of statues, and the repudiating of classic American values as backward and bigoted. "White supremacy" had to be replaced with "anti-racism," echoing the Cult of Reason's attacks on the Catholic Church in France.

As an aside, one of the founders of Black Lives Matter, Patriss Cullors, is herself a voodoo practitioner, just like Dutty Boukman before her. Cullors has often spoken of being an ordained practitioner of *Ifá*, a practice originating in West Africa. One of BLM's most well-known tactics is the chanting of a name of a deceased member of the community in a group march, repeating the name followed by, "Say his/her name." This is directly tied to the *Ifá* practice of spirit summoning and often includes the pouring of libations.[18]

Much as the old French and then Haitian revolutionaries operated off of fervor, force, and fear, today's American leftists do not operate on logic but passion. The common moderate refrain that "facts don't care about your feelings" must be reversed—*feelings don't care about your facts*. Leftists operate from envy. There is no way to reason with those who manipulate the have-nots en masse to loot and to shoot. They simply hate those who are good-looking and successful. The egalitarian ideology is just window dressing.

It's not about equality; it's about revenge.

The French revolutionaries' fiery hatred of their forebears sees its mirror today in modern leftist ideology. You destroy something because it feels good to destroy something beautiful and orderly. You couldn't make it in society, so you tear that society down without regard for what replaces it. The police are racist, so just get rid of them ("Defund the police.") Meritocracy is bad, so just get rid of it with so-called "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" (DEI, or sometimes DIE). Racial equality is not enough, not for America's radical left or for the Haitian hate mobs. In the present-day US, a new intersectional hierarchy was formed, with normal people who support racial equality and color-blindness under the law getting denounced as racists— without irony and not as a joke.

In this and other ways, present-day America is a dark inversion of the first years of the French Revolution. The French Revolution promised equality under the law and meritocracy. But modern leftism specifically discards both. They want to take the lowest rung of society and put them on the top. Some have termed this "Bio-Leninism." We do not protest the label.

In China, the CCP literally did this. During Chairman Mao's era, the Communist Party seized factories and factories, murdered the managers, and set the untrained day laborers in charge. The result was a mass famine that killed tens of millions. More on that later.

Fortunately, America has not reached anywhere near that level of dysfunction, but China's example offers a sobering preview of where we might be headed should the politics of resentment be left unchecked. From the looks of it, all we have are our duplicate copies of the poor man's Louis XIV running Washington, DC, and the capital cities of most states.

We'll let you sit with the ramifications of the French revolutionary template as we leave you with this: *The Main Currents of Marxism* by Polish historian Leszek Kolakowski suggests that the Marxist worldview claims to advocate for the equality of all men but is no more than bitterness that they, the Marxists, are inferior to others. The French Revolution fits this frame, as

does modern American leftism: ugly, violent people dress up their bloodlust and jealousy as some heroic fight for equality, then go on to tear everything down. Whether we're talking about the Jacobins, the Marxists, or the race mobs burning down our cities, it's always the same ideas, and they will always have the same results.

They don't want a workers' paradise; they want to burn down cities.

This is what they do.

French Revolution Death Toll: 100,000
Haitian Revolution Death Toll: 345,000

CHAPTER 6

BLOOD ON THE SNOW: THE UNTOLD STORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Your worst sin is that you have destroyed and betrayed yourself for nothing.
—Fyodor Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*

Unhumans are not particularly intelligent. Great promises are made to the people they win over during the initial sweep into power. By fear, with surprise, and through force, unhumans have in various times and places subdued opposition or driven it far and away. But the regime that grants the unhumans absolute power over their adversaries does not give way to utopia, or anything like it. And so those promises go unfulfilled. Utopia looks more like anarchy. The unhumans may be brutal, but many are typically bumblers as well. They possess an instinct of cruelty but are not known for managing the consequences of it.

This was evident in the individual called Yakov Yurovsky, who commanded the red guard the night the Romanov family was murdered in cold blood. It was he who personally ordered the Tsar and his wife and children into the cellar where they and their servants were reduced to bloody corpses. Unhumans seek vengeance; they are not always particularly effective at it.

Yurovsky was from a Jewish family, and there had been violent pogroms toward Jews during late imperial Russia, so much so that Yurovsky had previously fled to Germany where Jews were safe (at the time). Upon return to Russia, he immediately joined the Bolsheviks. Where he likely had motivation, he lacked competence.

The executioner Yurovsky's official account of the execution of the Russian imperial family and the immediate aftermath reads like a bloody slasher flick script meets dark comedy. Yurovsky managed to smuggle firearms into the building where the Tsar and his family were staying at that time, following abdication of the throne—a place called Ipatiev House hidden deep in central Russia.

On the night of July 16, 1918, Yurovsky's thugs ordered the family awake and to get dressed; they would be going somewhere. The women put on their gowns. Suspicion unaroused, the Christian Romanovs and their servants followed their guards to the cellar. Out came the guns.

Yurovsky later wrote in his official report of the matter that Tsar Nicholas's last word was, *What?*

Yurovsky gave the word. When the firing squad began shooting, Tsarina Alexandra reportedly murmured a prayer, the sign of the cross. She never finished it. Errant shots hit the brick wall, ricocheted everywhere, and reportedly grazed his own men. The Romanov parents died instantly; their children, not so.

The Romanov daughters, Olga, Tatiana, Maria, and Anastasia, wore thick dresses made of diamonds and also had jewelry hidden on their persons, the thugs would later find. In the smoke, the guards heard only shrieks but could not see anything. The screaming did not cease. They realized the children had survived the initial volley of shots. So, out came the bayonets. These were no match for their ladies' gowns, and the diamonds and jewels prevented the murderers from stabbing them to death.

Finally, once Yurovsky could make out the situation just a few feet away, direct headshots were ordered at close range, even of young Prince Alexi, the only son of Nicholas and Alexandra. The girls and their brother were summarily executed, one by one. The Russian Imperial family was no more. No direct heirs survived. The new order had begun with blood on the snow.[1]

The Road to St. Petersburg

The 1917 Russian Revolution was the first true communist revolution. The unhumanity of the Romanov family's fate in 1918 was a link in the iron chain of revolutionary history, with many links spanning decades both before and after. We've previously covered the backdrop of pertinent imperial history up to the outbreak of uprising. To review:

- Imperial Russia, like pre-revolutionary France, had been an absolute monarchy for centuries, which created an extreme divide and disparity between the haves and the have-nots.
- Until 1861, Russian peasantry were slaves by another name. The abolition of serfdom didn't improve their lot (much).
- The secluded empire of Japan humiliated a laggardly industrializing Russia, in the 1905 Russo-Japanese war.
- *The Communist Manifesto* had spread from Germany to Russia in the character of Vladimir Lenin and his comrades the Bolsheviks, the most radical of all the various malcontents in Russian sociopolitics ready for change and willing to force it.

What we didn't mention in previous sections on Russia that are now pertinent include the assassinations of Tsar Alexander II—grandfather of Nicholas II—and Pyotr Stolypin, one of the last pre-revolutionary prime ministers of Russia, in 1881 and 1911, respectively. The assassinations were at the hands of anarcho-socialists. It was Alexander II who had ended the practice of serfdom, ironically, and Stolypin who reformed the debt slavery system so peasants could finally own their own homes and lands. Defeat by Japan upturned Russian society in what we now remember as the 1905 Revolution. Soldiers mutinied, workers striked, and peasants revolted. Like Louis XVI before him, Nicholas II attempted to avert a toppling of the old order. He agreed to a new Russian constitution and allowed for a parliament—and appointed the great land reformer Stolypin. He did not deserve his fate.

Imperial Russia at least had a future; the have-nots, after centuries of autocratic rule, finally had a ladder to climb upward toward prosperity. But World War I tore it all down. The lesson of Japan went unlearned.

The Great War exposed the true inadequacy of the Russian state, as the industrialized Germans crushed them on the battlefield. The Russians took millions of losses, adding suffering in their western border to match the previous embarrassment in their far east. This sorry state of affairs emboldened already-radical actors to rise seemingly out of nowhere and gain overnight credibility. To oppose the status quo was to be the voice of reason (there's that little word again).

In early 1917, Nicholas II learned there were riots in St. Petersburg. They began on March 8, which the Bolsheviks later declared as International Women's Day. Not just the workers in the streets, but the soldiers joining as well. It was 1905 all over again. The Tsar's advisors (including the nefarious Rasputin) told him this time was different— the government was, in fact, to be overthrown. Nicholas II pleaded with his cousin George V of Great Britain for a way of escape from Russia to England—*No, that's your problem* was the gist of his answer. Abdication was the only out. And so in the span of a week, the Russian monarchy, an institution that has lasted centuries, was no more.

A provisional government formed. Its officials promised everything early-stage revolutions promise, such as greater representation, democratic elections, and a *new* new constitution. And of course, the previous was to be arrested—that meant the Tsar, his entire family, and close allies.

As in France a century and a quarter prior, mere capture of the king was not enough for the most radical. In Russia, as you learned, these were the workers' councils, known as soviets. There were soviets in factories, those made up of active-duty soldiers and veterans, soviets of rural workers and day laborers, and so on. Anywhere there were people of like mind and class to be organized, there was a soviet.

The traveling Marxist ideologue Vladimir Lenin was released from his imprisonment by the Germans while they and the Tsarist regime had been at war. He was sent to Russia to stir up trouble and knock the empire out of the war. The goal was regime change in Russia. What could go wrong? Lenin stepped off the train in St. Petersburg in 1917 and made the people a promise they literally ate up: *Peace, land, bread*.

Vladimir Lenin was born into a middle-class family in Simbirsk, Russia, in 1870, with his father being an educator and his mother a noblewoman. Like Yakov Yurovsky whose story began this chapter, Lenin had a bone to pick with traditionalist Russia. Several, actually. Two hundred and six to be exact. Lenin's older brother Aleksandr, a turn-of-the-century radical, had been executed in 1887. He'd plotted and failed to assassinate Alexander III, son of the murdered Alexander II. Lenin himself was exiled to Siberia in 1897, punishment for carrying on his brother's activist legacy.

All Lenin had to do was offer what Russians not only wanted but needed—permanent end to foreign wars, permanent land reforms superior even to Stolypin's, and permanent food security for all. Of course, Bolshevik rule would mean total warfare against the Russian people for decades to come, full land collectivization with no private ownership, and strategic famines to punish the non-loyal with slow and painful and heartbreaking mass death. But that wasn't part of the sales pitch. Lenin offered relief from the appalling conditions of the status quo, and the people were primed thanks to effective OPE. And so the Bolsheviks lit the match.

Violence began in the countryside and moved into the cities quickly. As in the French Revolution, communist-led mobs of Russian peasants seized land and killed landowners—and

they were allowed to keep what they took.

In October 1917, the Bolsheviks stormed the Winter Palace of St. Petersburg, where the provisional government was seated. Just like in revolutionary France and Paris, anything that happened in St. Petersburg affected all of Russia. Supported by local soviets, the Bolsheviks kept control, legitimizing their claim to power. At first, they faced no serious opposition, more eloquent speeches and triumphant reinforced the perfect persuasion of *Peace, Land, Bread*.

One of those who might have brought the revolution to an abrupt end in Napoleon- or Caesar-like fashion was General Aleksei Brusilov, one of the most successful Russian officers during World War I, winning victory after victory over Austro-Hungarian imperial forces. He was a devout Orthodox Christian, and he was deeply loyal to his nation, but instead of taking action, he instead took the lack of actions. He seemed to reason that, as a Russian patriot, whoever the majority of the Russian people decided to lead was the legitimate authority. Brusilov thought the reds seemed too angry to rule, too radical and hoped this period would pass, with moderates emerging to bring law and order. He thought that by sitting back and doing nothing, the moderates would simply overtake the unhuman bolsheviks by magic, or something. This was the same mistake of Nicholas II and Louis XVI before him—to assume a return to sanity. It is what many of Brusilov's contemporaries thought as well.

"Social life followed its usual course, and it seemed as if these people were merely to be the spectators and not the victims of the drama to come," wrote Pyotr Wrangel, describing Russia's upper-class mindset even as the Bolshevik revolution was already underway.[2] The revolution comes for those who can't believe it. It always does. In December 1917, the wealth of the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, and foreign investors was seized. In fact, *all* private bank accounts were nationalized and their assets were declared the property of the people, essentially debanking the upper classes and those associated with the former Tsarist regime. It could have gone no other way.

Also amid the turmoil, there was a significant breakdown in the Russian penal system, with many prisoners being released either officially by decree or through the chaos of the revolution. The Bolsheviks issued several decrees that led to the release of political prisoners. However, the chaotic situation also meant that many common criminals were released or escaped. The immediate post-revolution period saw a rise in crime, partly attributed to these releases. Again, no other way.

Because once the Incitement of Act I occurs, there is no going back from what lies ahead in Acts II and III. This is what Brusilov and many other would-be great men of history failed to comprehend: The unhumans will not stop unless they are stopped. Brusilov wrongfully supported the Bolsheviks for a pragmatic reason and died in isolated disrepute.

But where the Russian Revolution begins to break course with the French template is organized opposition. It soon emerged. It wasn't Brusilov, but it was bold. Enough to transition revolution into civil war.

The Russian Civil War

Spoiler Alert: The Bolsheviks won. The imprisoned Romanovs were executed. Communist rule was established throughout the former Russian empire and lasted until December 26, 1991. This fate did not come without a fight. Stood opposed to Vladimir Lenin was Pyotr Wrangel, a junior general in the so-called White Army—the assumed name of all anti-Bolshevik forces prior to and following the abdication of the Tsar.

Pyotr Wrangel, feared by the Bolsheviks as the Black Baron, was born into a noble Baltic

German family in 1878. Graduating from the prestigious Nikolaev Engineering Military Academy, Wrangel displayed exceptional strategic acumen and leadership skills. Rising through the ranks of the Imperial Russian Army, he distinguished himself in various conflicts, including World War I. Following the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, Wrangel aligned himself with the anti-Bolshevik White movement, becoming a key figure in their resistance against the Red Army, and known for his staunch opposition to Bolshevik ideology and loyalty to the Russian Empire.

The Black Baron was widely described for his distinguished appearance, often described as imposing at a height of around 6-foot-3, with a strong, chiseled jawline and piercing eyes that exuded authority. He typically dressed in the traditional uniform of a Russian military officer, adorned with medals and insignia, projecting an aura of dignity and command wherever he went. His forces respected him for demanding discipline and ushering swift justice when the need required.

Prior to Wrangel, opposition to the reds was disorganized and non-collaborative. And so Lenin pitted varying factions against each other while making agreements with different nations within the fast-dissolving empire to ensure his victory. But Wrangel wrangled together support for a traditional Russia, and they held out control over southern Russia as well as Crimea. Unfortunately, what unified the White Army became their greatest liability—their figurehead, Tsar Nicholas II, the true leader of Russia. While the Romanovs lived, the Whites planned their campaigns around attempts at rescue. First, St. Petersburg, the Bolshevik stronghold where they were held. The White Army failed, so the royal family was moved to the Ural Mountains, far away from nationalist activity. But when a dispatch of Whites finally came close, the Bolsheviks decided the Romanovs were more trouble than they were worth. Enter Yakov Yurovsky.

Dekulakization

The Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Lenin and later Joseph Stalin, implemented harsh policies toward the kulaks, who were prosperous peasants or farmers in Russia. The term “kulak” was broadly used to describe those who owned more land or livestock than the average peasant. Basically, a kulak is like what you might call a small business owner or landlord in America today. And we know how the Left treats those. They’ve always been like this. In the early years following the Revolution of 1917, Lenin’s government introduced measures such as land redistribution, which targeted the kulaks as part of their broader goal to dismantle the old feudal system and establish socialism. However, it was under Stalin’s leadership in the 1930s that the repression against the kulaks intensified.

Stalin’s policies aimed at collectivizing agriculture and eliminating private farming further marginalized the kulaks. The government portrayed them as class enemies and obstacles to the collectivization process. In response, the regime initiated a brutal campaign of *dekulakization*, which involved mass arrests, deportations, and executions of kulaks and their families. Millions were forcibly relocated to remote areas or sent to labor camps, where many perished due to harsh conditions. This brutal campaign not only devastated the kulaks economically but also led to widespread suffering and loss of life among rural communities, profoundly altering the agrarian landscape of the Soviet Union.

The cold-blooded murder of innocent men, women, and children is a major plot point in the story of the Russian Revolution. To target military-age males was not enough. Relative to other revolutions, the Bolsheviks were efficient about robbing and killing anyone deemed a threat to Lenin, to Joseph Stalin, and beyond. Continuous murder and mayhem were the twin defining

features of the Soviet regime for its first thirty years. The main organization given the task of carrying out these brutal operations was the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs, known better by its Russian acronym NKVD—the predecessor to the more well-known KGB. Through this and other organs, the newly formed Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, shortened to the USSR or Soviet Union, exercised its power.

Another memorable example of Soviet ruthlessness occurred during the run-up to World War II. Nazi Germany had split Poland with the Soviet Union. The NKVD rolled in, arrested thousands of Polish army officers, and deported priests and intellectuals en masse. Many were sent to labor camps in Siberia, just as the young Lenin had. Twenty thousand of these Polish prisoners were taken to Moscow. After six months, the Soviets decided, much as they had with the Romanovs, they were too dangerous to be left alive. They shot them all. All of them. They never spoke of it again, and when they did, they blamed it on the Nazis. This was the Katyn Massacre.

The Soviet way was stupid when it was not vicious. Early in Bolshevik rule, they tried abolishing money. When that didn't work, they implemented the New Economic Policy, which allowed for limited private enterprise. Though intended as a temporary measure, this limited form of free enterprise allowed food and goods to appear again in usable quantities. A smart, select few got rich doing this—the so-called "NEPmen." When passed the baton from Lenin to Stalin, the great rollback began. Everything was to return to state control. These NEPmen, these successful peasants who made something of themselves, had become haves in a nation still comprised of mostly have-nots. Those who had prospered under the New Economic Policy, in particular the kulaks, were to be robbed and killed. And yet these were not even aristocrats; the old nobility were either dead or fled. These were small businessmen, hardworking Russians who'd cobbled together a new life in dark times. They lived nowhere near the nerve centers of power, tied to the central regime. Nevertheless, they were targeted for destruction. This is what they do.

Let's pause on this for a moment—it was a *crime* to make something of yourself in the Soviet Union. Whatever you worked hard for had to be taken away, "collectivized." NEPmen and kulaks had no desire to unseat the communists since they fared relatively better under them. And yet they were rounded up and shot.

Farther west, in modern-day Ukraine, "Europe's breadbasket," the best farmers were punished the worst. From *Revelations of the Russian Archives*, the story of the Holodomor:

> The policy of all-out collectivization instituted by Stalin in 1929 to finance industrialization had a disastrous effect on agricultural productivity. Nevertheless, in 1932 Stalin raised Ukraine's grain procurement quotas by forty-four percent. This meant that there would not be enough grain to feed the peasants, since Soviet law required that no grain from a collective farm could be given to the members of the farm until the government's quota was met. Stalin's decision and the methods used to implement it condemned millions of peasants to death by starvation. Party officials, with the aid of regular troops and secret police units, waged a merciless war of attrition against peasants who refused to give up their grain. Even indispensable seed grain was forcibly confiscated from peasant households. Any man, woman, or child caught taking even a handful of grain from a collective farm could be, and often was, executed or deported. Those who did not appear to be starving were often suspected of hoarding grain. Peasants were prevented from leaving their villages by the NKVD and a system of internal

passports.

The death toll from the 1932–33 famine in Ukraine has been estimated between six million and seven million. According to a Soviet author, "Before they died, people often lost their senses and ceased to be human beings."[3]

Unhumans. This is what they do.

The lasting terror of the Russian Revolution is how thoroughly it remade Russian society. If you wonder what defines the Russian spirit today, you'll begin to realize that Russians are far more likely to take a cynical view of morality—even the religious among them are like this. The Soviets did everything possible to mess with their heads, as a people. For example, instead of just taking down the Orthodox Church like they did in the pre–World War II years, later Soviets appointed KGB assets to head the Church. Confession, which is supposed to be between the penitent and the priest, was no longer secret; instead, it's all handed over to the KGB, straight to your file. It does not need to be explained how awful it is for an institution to appear safe and helpful, to be used against you in the most ruthless way. Communists like the system of everyone informing on everyone else. In post-revolutionary Russia, people weren't usually shot at random; instead, they designed a vast networked informant system in which anyone denounced as a traitor to the regime would be swiftly executed—and anyone could be an informant … or one informed on. During Stalin's reign, two million Communist Party members were killed outright, purged for one ideological offense or another because the NKVD had to hit a quota. This practice wasn't just Stalinist policy—it happened under Lenin, too. It happened as the Revolution ran its course in the beginning. The Bolshevik movement overflowed with unhumans anxious for revenge. They even exported this ideology around the world, via the Communist International or Comintern. It would be as if we took the modern-day so-called "Antifa" radicals and put them in charge of a world power with a powerful military intelligence apparatus, and they got to do whatever they wanted.

That said, this may not be too difficult for us to imagine. In Lenin's day and in ours, unhumans know how to frame a narrative. Lenin himself said that the modern political struggle wasn't about theory, but about who will overtake whom, often shortened to the "Who, whom?" question we wrote about earlier. Modern leftists in the West also frame politics in these terms: "Who will overtake whom, the police or the 'black bodies' they oppress? Who will overtake whom, greedy capitalist landlords or the poor renters unable to afford a mortgage whom they squeeze?" *Who, whom?* demands that you identify your allies and enemies. The left knows who they favor and whom they don't. If you are disfavored, any misfortune that befalls you is obviously your fault. Or it never happened, actually, that's just conspiracy theory. But it's *good* that it happened. Check your privilege. Free speech is hate speech, so you don't get any.

Let revolutionaries rule over you, and they will decide on an arbitrary basis, who wins, who loses, who lives, who dies, who prospers, who suffers, and who goes to prison or exile. They will not be smart about it, but you can be sure they will be cruel. Ridiculous things happen when unhumans are in charge—more than you may realize.

Ouroboros as Strategy

Ouroboros refers to the ancient symbol of a snake consuming its own tail. Most see this as a warning, unhumans seem to take it as a policy.

At last, we return to Yakov Yurovsky and to the last night of the Romanovs. As we saw, he

mismanaged that night about as badly as could be imagined. He also botched what came after.

In his official account, Yurovsky admitted he had not thought through the ramifications of Romanov family martyrdom and the sure effect that would have on the approaching White Army. There was evidence of murder, much of it, and it all had to be gotten rid of.

First, there was the matter of what to be done with the corpses. Stretchers were suggested. No, that would leave trails of blood outside where a truck was waiting to proceed to disposal. So someone found military-grade woolen cloth to line the stretchers and the truck bed. After the first was taken to the truck, Yurovsky caught two men looting the other bodies. They lied, of course. He threatened a second firing squad. They fessed up and turned out their pockets. Yurovsky dismissed them, ordered all bodies be left where they lay, and proceeded to pre-loot each himself. Collecting quite a haul, he carried it all personally to the commander of his guards.

A number of hours passed before all was ready for the truck's departure. But there wasn't a destination; nobody had thought through what to do in the way of a funeral or mass grave or cremation or any of it. The driver suggested a nearby iron and steelworks. Yurovsky had never heard of it. They went anyway.

On the way, a caravan of carriages and men on horseback appeared from the forest and stopped the truck. Apparently, they were expecting to intercept the Romanovs alive. Back-and-forth, further delay. The voyage continued until the truck veered into a tight spot between two trees and got stuck. The situation proved too tempting for the accompanying red guards, who re-looted what had been left on the family's persons, particularly the girls. Yurovsky found the scene, ordered them out of sight, and posted guards while he wandered in the direction of the factory on foot. Perhaps a forest grave, somewhere along the way? No, all of a sudden, he happened upon a campfire of peasant workers. It was daybreak. They'd be seen. Word might spread to the Whites.

Yurovsky returned to the truck and ordered all company away, save for the most trusted few. He decided to have the bodies stripped and the bloodied garments burned. Unhuman. Diamonds, other precious stones, and pure gold previously concealed were revealed. This did not burn and so had to be disposed of. Red guards who visited the site of the bonfire the next day found additional diamonds in the embers Yurovsky had somehow missed.

Yurovsky knew the odor of burning flesh might bring the whole White Army down upon him, so he ordered all remains dumped in a nearby mine. This was in error; water barely covered the bodies, so Yurovsky debated with the guards whether to bomb the mine into rubble to seal their crimes in, or something else. He ultimately posted guards, left the site, and headed straight to the local communist authorities to report the mess. They offered no help, and Yurovsky decided to order his guards to raise the bodies from the mine for reburial elsewhere. They did; the mine recovery took all that next night.

Meanwhile, Yurovsky pursued a lead on another mine, this one more remote and presumed abandoned. The car he was in broke down en route. This pattern of bumbling continued—Yurovsky got a horse, the beast injured his foot, his men just dug a pit rather than make the second mine trip, a local spotted them, they filled in the pit, the truck got stuck again. Finally, it was decided to burn a few corpses, bury the remains, dig a mass grave for the rest, disfigure them with sulfuric acid, and rebury, with railroad ties on top so as to disguise the scene as a road. The Romanovs would not be found until 1979.[4]

Yurovsky lived to age sixty, but not before the Soviet secret police, the NKVD, arrested his daughter and deported her to the gulag for ten years, guilty for being the wrong kind of communist, a devotee of Lenin contemporary Leon Trotsky rather than Joseph Stalin. Later,

Yurovsky's son, a Soviet naval officer, was also arrested. It was after his daughter's sentencing that Yurovsky was suddenly hospitalized with a peptic ulcer. Some historians believe he was poisoned—by the NKVD. He died a slow and painful death. He finally became a good communist.

"How you do anything is how you do everything," the popular saying goes. This is the way of the communist. What grants absolute power over another does not maintain it. Unhumans are arguably the best there are at organizing; they are worst at *being* organized. This is the reason for the *Ouroboros*; they must eat their own rank and file because that is all they are able to do with competence. One moment, they shoot their victims; the next, they threaten to shoot each other. As history reveals, they often follow through. Terror needs more of itself to survive; a perpetual state of panic and revolution is required. The terror is the point. The blood is the point. The mass killing is the point. They do not believe what they say; they just want an excuse to burn cities and murder people. Scale the scene of the Romanov murders up, and that is the story of early Soviet Russia: nasty, brutal, and vicious. And occasionally stupid.

The Last Stand of the Imperial Guard

There were several points where someone besides Pyotr Wrangel—or alongside him—could have swept in, fought back, and crushed the Bolsheviks. Bolshevik means "the majority" but of course, they never held elections or anything like that. Wrangel was not able to stop them, despite his valiant last stand. Here's why, and what we can learn.

First, the incumbent Russian powers-that-were did not perceive Marxist-Leninists as a powerful threat. Even when the reds seized cities, it was not believed they would go the distance. The Soviet Union could have been nipped in the bud; it was not, and instead, its roots grew deep and its branches broad, casting shadows over hundreds of millions the world over for decades.

A second missed opportunity was simply the West dropping the ball. Perhaps they did so on purpose. An infamous example is *New York Times* journalist Walter Duranty visiting and writing heaping praise upon the Soviet Union. This false reporting won him a Pulitzer. During World War II, the American press often repeated Soviet talking points, accepting without doubt the official USSR justification for invading Poland and Finland. The US news media also blasted Chiang Kai-shek as corrupt, and claimed it only made sense that the communists definitely could and arguably should win (they did).

And finally, perhaps the most-missed opportunity to crush the Russian Revolution was the one missed the most, by the most people. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn writes in *The Gulag Archipelago*:

> At what point, then, should one resist? When one's belt is taken away? When one is ordered to face into a corner? When one crosses the threshold of one's home? An arrest consists of a series of incidental irrelevancies, of a multitude of things that do not matter, and there seems no point in arguing about one of them individually … and yet all these incidental irrelevancies taken together implacably constitute the arrest.[5]

To take Solzhenitsyn at his words, the Russian everyman had potential to be the great man of history—the one who resisted. *Not on my watch*. Elsewhere, Solzhenitsyn suggests reciprocity with the reds, using their own weapon of terror against them to squash uprising:

> What would things have been like if every Security operative, when he went out at night to make an arrest, had been uncertain whether he would return alive and had to say goodbye to his family? Or if, during periods of mass arrests, as for example in Leningrad, when they arrested a quarter of the entire city, people had not simply sat there in their lairs, paling with terror at every bang of the downstairs door and at every step on the staircase, but had understood they had nothing left to lose and had boldly set up in the downstairs hall an ambush of half a dozen people with axes, hammers, pokers, or whatever else was at hand? … The Organs would very quickly have suffered a shortage of officers and transport and, notwithstanding all of Stalin's thirst, the cursed machine would have ground to a halt! If … if … We didn't love freedom enough. And even more —we had no awareness of the real situation … We purely and simply deserved everything that happened afterward.[6]

The White Army under Pyotr Wrangel was willing to fight back and fight hard. Wrangel was so effective, the Soviets would have to assassinate him to prevent a counterrevolution. He was the likeliest figure to lead such an effort, had there been one. And there was about to be, too, even after the fall of St. Petersburg and the murder of the Romanovs. To shorten a long story, Wrangel had not gotten along well with peer leadership in the White Army, and he left Russia for Constantinople (now Istanbul, Turkey) in 1920. But not six weeks passed before he was called out of retirement/exile and assumed the post of commander in chief of the White Army, located in Crimea, and received executive power as well.

And yet it was too late. The coalition government Wrangel formed and led could not catch up with the Bolshevik swarm. Military engagements would halve the remaining White Army, and he would have no choice but to order an evacuation of all anti-communists from Soviet territory.

On November 14, 1920, the Russian Civil War was effectively over, as the last White Army ship sailed out of unfriendly waters. As the Bolshevik forces tightened their grip on the Crimean Peninsula in 1920, Wrangel, commanding the White Army, faced the grim reality of impending defeat. With unwavering resolve and a sense of duty to his men and the civilian population, Wrangel orchestrated a meticulous evacuation plan. As the evacuation reached its climax, Wrangel made the ultimate sacrifice, ensuring the safety of his comrades and countless refugees before boarding the final ship himself. With the echoes of conflict fading behind him, Wrangel stood alone on the deck, a symbol of resilience and determination, as the vessel sailed into the waters of the Black Sea for Constantinople. His large, solitary figure marked the end of an era in Crimea, the last stand of the Russian Empire.

Suffering not one but potentially two assassination attempts, Wrangel established the Russian All-Military Union in 1924, an organization of all fellow exiled White Army veterans and those who had served in imperial forces previously, as Wrangel himself had before the revolution. Wrangel also became the de facto leader of and voice for *all* Russians who had escaped. Like many, he would find work and build a new life farther West. For Wrangel, that was a career as a mining engineer in Brussels, Belgium. We implore you to read his memoir, *Always with Honor*, published in 1928.

About those assassination attempts … the first alleged attack was the 1920 sinking of a boat he owned but was not on at the time. The second, also alleged, came in 1928. If it was, in fact, assassination, it was successful. Wrangel passed away suddenly in Brussels. Suspicion was cast on a suspected Soviet agent, the brother of a butler who had access to the Wrangel household.

Wrangel fought the communists so well that they (very likely) took him out. Unlike other

targets of Lenin and Stalin, Wrangel was, had been, and would remain the chief threat to the Soviet Union. They knew he alone could restore the Russian Empire. That is legacy.

Wrangel's funeral procession was held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, where he had settled in exile. It was a solemn and regal affair that drew attention from around the world. His tomb is still in Belgrade today. Wrangel was extremely respected among Russian émigrés and anti-communists for his steadfast opposition to the Bolshevik regime. As his casket made its way through the streets of Belgrade, draped in Imperial Russian and Serbian flags, thousands of mourners paid their respects, including members of the Russian diaspora, Yugoslav officials, and foreign diplomats. The procession reflected not only the passing of a military leader but also the end of an era for the Russian émigré community, as Wrangel's death symbolized the fading hopes of many exiles for a return to their homeland under Bolshevik rule. Wrangel's funeral was the last formal ceremony of the Russian Empire.

To the last, Wrangel never wavered in his loyalty to the Romanov family, to the Russian Empire, and his steadfast conviction that communism must be defeated.

When Wrangel was asked by a journalist why the White Army fought, he had this to say. From his memoir, *Always with Honor*:

> There can be only one answer to this question… . We are fighting for freedom. On the other side of the northern front despotism, oppression, and slavery reign supreme. One can have the most varied opinion as to the opportuneness of such and such a regime, one may be republican, radical, socialist, or even Marxist, and still realize that the so-called Soviet Republic is nothing but the expression of an unprecedented, sinister despotism, which is sending Russia into a decline. Even the so-called governing class, the proletariat, are oppressed as much as the rest of the population. Europe no longer regards it a mystery — the veil has been torn from the face of Soviet Russia. Moscow is the heart and centre of the reaction, for there live the tyrants who treat the people like beasts. As for ourselves, anyone who treats us as reactionaries must be either blind or dishonest. We are fighting to free our people from a bondage such as they have never experienced before, even in the darkest epochs of their history. For a long time Europe did not understand this, but it seems that she is just beginning to understand what we realize so clearly—the world-wide significance of our Civil War. If our sacrifices are to prove in vain, European society, European democracy, will be forced to take up arms to defend its cultural and political possessions against an enemy who is drunk with success.[7]

We cannot help but wonder in grief how different the story of Pyotr Wrangel would and could have ended had he become sole commander of the White Army earlier—and had the White Army's predecessor the imperial army of Tsarist Russia treated the threat of Bolshevism as it needed to be treated. But it was not, even when it was obviously about to be too late to do so. As Solzhenitsyn said, the uprising went unresisted, to a man—even as those men and soldiers saw what was coming. And yet they did not respond accordingly. Terror has that effect. By the time it's felt, it's too late.

Another opportunity for alternative history and White Army victory is the Franco strategy, which you'll read more about in the next chapter. If you are already familiar with the Spanish Civil War, you know that the governments of Germany and Italy threw tactical support behind Francisco Franco and his Nationalist army. This made their civil war the fair fight that the Russian Revolution and Russian Civil War were not.

And so we're left to wonder. What if US President Woodrow Wilson saw Vladimir Lenin for who he was and would become? What if the Tsar's own cousin had recognized the true enemy in the 1910s was not the competing empire of Germany, but the dark forces of unhumanity ready and willing to murder his own flesh in cold blood? What if indeed.

We close with Solzhenitsyn:

> Every man always has handy a dozen glib little reasons why he is right not to sacrifice himself.[8]

Beyond Pyotr Wrangel, most Russians did not. The unhumans won. They robbed and killed at abandon until there was no one left to rob and kill.

This is what they do.

Death Toll of the Russian Revolution: 20 million

CHAPTER 7

THE LAST CRUSADE: THE UNTOLD STORY OF THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR

> *To promote the ideology of collectivism, false leaders are willing to stoop to the lowest and slimiest of Communist-Socialist tricks. One of these tricks … is to declare that all anti-Communists must be, per se, pro-Fascist.*[1]
>
> —Verne P. Kaub, *Communist-Socialist Propaganda in American Schools*

Internet-search "Generalisimo Franco" and the first results you're likely to see are descriptors such as "rebel leader," "dictator," and of course "fascist." Look up images of his rule in Spain, and you'll quickly find amateur-edited photographs showing a side-by-side of Francisco Franco with Adolf Hitler and, naturally, swastikas.

It is often said that history is written by the winners, but the Spanish Civil War is a strange exception. Indeed, most accounts portray the communist-socialist republic Franco fought as "the good guys"—this despite their loss to his forces. Such an elementary (and incorrect) understanding of the initial uprising, armed resistance, eventual overthrow, and prelude to World War II was introduced to many of us by widespread required reading in school, such as *For Whom the Bell Tolls* by Ernest Hemingway and *Homage to Catalonia* by George Orwell (the same guy who wrote *1984* and *Animal Farm*). The "Manuel Azaña good, Francisco Franco bad" narrative is retold and reinforced in popular media, from streaming documentaries to following your own curiosity about the Spanish civil war on Wikipedia. Challenge, this narrative and you're going to have a bad time, as our man Jack did.

This chapter is adapted from the *Human Events Daily* episode of the same name. Upon airing over Christmas 2023, there was great weeping and gnashing of teeth. Communists and leftists from Spain, the UK, and the United States condemned Posobiec and guest cohost Blake Neff for the Franco episode. They were decried as neofascists so loudly and widely that Franco became trending news on X (formerly Twitter). In fact, the podcast episode went so viral and so against the allowed narrative, that it was actually banned in Spain through X. Downloads were substantial, and of all the *Human Events Daily* 2023 episodes on communist revolutions, Franco's was by far the most popular.

All for the crime of going against the preferred story. That is, against the story we're told—that the republicans fought bravely for civil rights and social justice, and the nationalists staged a brutal military coup and tortured their adversaries in dark, dingy prisons for decades thereafter for the thrill of it is the story from the perspective of the losing side. This is the case not just in English-speaking media and education but also in Spain. In 2007, Spain passed the Law of Historic Memory, which mandated the removal of all remaining Franco tributes and symbols from public buildings, with some exceptions for works of religious or artistic significance. This comes after the efforts began in 1975 following Franco's death when removal and destruction of statues, street names, and plaques commemorating those who died in the Spanish Civil War initially began. The Spanish people are forbidden from their own history.

Even when communists are defeated, their ideological descendants resurrect Act III, the purge. This is what they do. And as a result, in Spain's case, what the Spanish Civil War is rarely portrayed with is accuracy. One of the lone voices who gets it right is Warren Carroll, author of *The Last Crusade: Spain 1936*. A crusade, for the new initiates, is a righteous, justified war for the sake of the cross—that is, for the honor and glory of Jesus Christ. Specifically, this classical crusade is a war to protect Christians from persecution even unto death on account of their faith. Now, everyone has heard of the holy land crusades of the Middle Ages, but few know of the crusade that happened in Spain in 1936. You already know the setup—how the environment for anti-Christian hatred was sown and persecution reaped. How Franco was called to restore law and order. How the communist-socialist Rojos had free rein to inflict terror on countryside and city alike once political power was theirs.

From Carroll's book description:

> Everyone has heard of the crusades of the Middle Ages. But few know of the crusade in our time, which living men still remember, fought for this same purpose only sixty years ago in Spain. In just six months of the year 1936, 13 bishops and nearly 7,000 priests, seminarians, monks, and nuns were martyred in Spain by enemies of Christianity. It was the greatest clerical bloodletting in so short a span of time since the persecutions on the Church by the ancient Roman emperors. Already Pope John Paul II has beatified some 200 of these martyrs. Tens of thousands of churches, chapels, and shrines in Spain were pillaged or destroyed. In response, faithful Spanish Catholics proclaimed a crusade. Against all odds the crusaders triumphed, and the Church and the Faith in Spain were saved. This is the story of that crusade, now honored in no other book in print in the English language. Most people who know of the Spanish Civil War do not understand why it was fought or how it was really won. This book will tell you. There is no story like it in the history of the twentieth century.[2]

So what happened?

The Comintern Comes to Spain and So Does Hell Itself

We've covered much history since our last mentions of Spain in Chapter 4. So here's a quick review of the situation:

The Spanish Civil War was fought between 1936 and 1939 and ended in nationalist victory. In the run-up to the war, Spain fell into extreme social turmoil. A radical left and traditional right contended with one another in preceding years. When the Popular Front electoral victory turned

the government far-leftist, anti-religious and anti-landowner sentiment became national and local policy. The Soviet Union's Comintern, already assisting the Spanish communist movement, now hoped to export their red revolution using the coffers looted from the Russian treasury. The Spanish Republic's far-left policies attracted not only local anarchists but also Western radicals and communist-sympathizers, who would later write of their experiences in detail.

Communist militias, aligned with leftist Republican factions, the Rojos, viewed the Catholic Church as a symbol of oppression and a pillar of the conservative establishment they sought to overthrow. As a result, they sought to eradicate religious influence from areas under their control. Nuns and priests were seen as representatives of this influence and were therefore considered enemies of the revolution. In some instances, religious figures were given the choice to renounce their faith or face execution, while others were killed outright for their perceived allegiance to the Church. The violence against nuns and priests during the Spanish Civil War remains a dark chapter in the history of the conflict, reflecting the deep ideological divisions and tensions that tore Spanish society apart during this turbulent period.

In some instances, even sexual violence—rape—of nuns occurred, with reports that it took place within the confines of churches. There is substantial documented evidence and photographs of executed nuns having their corpses put on display by the Spanish Rojos in the town square. This was indicative of the belief that the new regime had supplanted the old, and as all revolutionary regimes do, they needed to destroy the previous religion of the old. In Spain, that meant that the churches had to be desecrated, priests killed, and nuns raped.

Antony Beevor in *The Battle for Spain: The Spanish Civil War 1936–1939* wrote of the unhuman brutality the Rojos inflicted upon the priests and other enemies of the socialist state: castration, disembowelment, burning alive, and burying alive after forcing the victims to dig their own graves. That said, targeting clergy and other professions including business owners was largely based on perceived class. Priests and shopkeepers perceived to be relatively poor were spared. Those deemed enemies of the poor were not. Beevor writes of rumors that an offense deemed worthy of murder by the revolutionaries was that of being seen in public wearing a hat and tie.[3]

Murder wasn't the end of the communist atrocities but merely the beginning. Rojos militias and affiliated organizations expropriated land from large landowners, often without compensation, and redistributed it among peasants and agricultural workers. The revolutionary hates private property. This process involved seizing estates, collectivizing farms, and establishing agricultural cooperatives where land was collectively owned and worked by the community—communes, just as in the USSR. Additionally, Spanish Rojos sought to dismantle the power and influence of landowners by targeting them politically and socially. Landowners perceived as aligned with the conservative or nationalist factions were often subjected to persecution, including arrest, confiscation of property, and in some cases, execution.

The agrarian reforms carried out by Spanish Rojos during the Civil War claimed to address long-standing grievances related to landownership and inequality in rural areas. However, these measures were also highly controversial and contributed to the polarization of Spanish society during the conflict. They never actually led to equality, only to bloodshed. After the war, when Franco's forces emerged victorious, many of these reforms were reversed, and land was returned to its previous owners.

One digressive yet provocate detail worth adding to the Spanish Civil War story is an unusual way the Rojos revolutionaries inflicted psychological torture on prisoners: modern art. From the *Washington Post* at the time:

> Researchers say the Soviet-inspired cells were the size of a walkin closet, with terra-cotta bricks sticking up from the floor at sharp angles …
>
> One wall was curved, and others were painted with circles, cubes, slanted lines, spirals, checkerboards and other shapes. By night a blinding red spotlight made it all appear to move and pulsate. Sense of time and distance crumbled.
>
> The light of day filtered through a window dyed green—the color these tormentors thought best for gutting a man's spirit.
>
> "Just seeing the inside of a cell is enough to make you dizzy," said Cesar Vidal, a historian who has written extensively on the war. "I imagine that if you were in there for days you could go mad."
>
> He estimated that several hundred people spent time in the cells, used to extract confessions or extort money.[4]

WaPo seems to be describing the modern art displays that assault citizens throughout major Western city centers and otherwise aweinspiring museums. Pinnacles of Western achievement have become open-air communist prisons, perhaps with the same effect on us all. But that's a story for another time.

Coming back to Spain now, when the Rojos forces were not imprisoning or torturing, they were robbing and killing. They had plenty of eager recruits along the way. The breakdown of order in many areas led to the release of prisoners. Both sides of the conflict—Communists and Nationalists—released prisoners for various reasons, including the enlistment of prisoners into military units. In Republican areas, the early months of the war saw mass releases of prisoners, including criminals, as part of the revolutionary fervor, leading to periods of lawlessness and retribution against perceived enemies.

This is what they do.

All that unhuman bloodshed unleashed upon Christians and landlords among other targets could not go unpunished. Total anarchy had been unleashed upon enemies of the red state; believers in an orderly, traditional Catholic Spain felt called to quell the terror. And so a counterrevolution was born in the shape of a big-tent coup d'état— a military uprising. Even this, we admit, is a loaded term. A military coup in the American mind is usually associated with some comically bemedaled governor-general character wearing a beret before cameras and between armed guards. And yet Francisco Franco and his forces the Nationalists were more akin to 1770s George Washington and the colonial patriots. Much like the United States founding fathers, Franco and his fellows saw themselves as rebels intended to overthrow a corrupt, tyrannical government that aided and abetted murder and rape as well as other repugnant sins. We believe the Nationalist cause was righteous and neo-American. These words of Thomas Jefferson, excerpted from the Declaration of Independence, perfectly describe the 1936 counterrevolution in Spain:

> Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government.[5]

As in the American Revolution, the defenders of principle had a steep uphill battle. Many battles, in fact. Franco did not anticipate an extended civil war; hoping for what, perhaps could have

been a repeat of the 1934 Asturias mining strike, in which Franco's forces crushed an uprising. However, the Nationalists initially took about only one-third of Spain. From there, they received much-needed reinforcements from a Spanish unit in Africa as well as support from aligned anti-communist groups in western and northwestern Spain. Meanwhile, Rojos forces controlled major cities such as Madrid and Barcelona as well as all of Catalonia in the northeast of the country. They also benefited from the full support of the Comintern; the leftist republic received weapons, ammunition, airplanes, tanks, and other vehicles from the Soviet Union to wage civil war, exceeding far more than comparable warfighting resources that were provided to the Nationalists by Germany and Italy combined. Worldwide communist organizations also mobilized international brigades of volunteers so any would-be radical could come to Spain to rob and/or kill any and all non-communists. In fact, one of these was called the International Antifascist Brigade.

The governments of Germany and Italy supported the Spanish Nationalists against the Soviet-backed Rojos in the war. "The enemy of my enemy is my friend." During World War II, which began just as the Spanish Civil War ended, no one adversary would be responsible for more Soviet casualties than Germany. Recall that pre-revolutionary France, a traditionalist absolute monarchy with serious grievances against it, supplied the American colonial army with essential supplies they were unable to get anywhere else. Benjamin Franklin was the man behind that persuasion of Louis XIV. We cannot fault Franco for doing exactly as Franklin and Washington had done before him to secure his country, and certainly should not judge history through the lens of the contemporary.

Despite total global communist support, the left ultimately lost Spain. Why? For that answer, we retell the same story of Bolshevik Russia: *nasty and stupid*. Unhumans in any time and place can organize, but they cannot *stay* organized. All they know to do once power is theirs is use that same power against themselves, a perpetual circular firing squad. That's basically what happened to the Second Spanish Republic.

The Left Eats Itself (Again)

The Spanish Civil War was not just a conflict between left and right, between anarchy and order, or between anti-Christians and Catholics, though it was all that and more. It was also a war between leftists and *further* leftists … and the further leftists who came after *these* leftists were executed … and then also against the even more extreme left following *those* leftists … and so on and so on.

Generalissimo Franco found his greatest allies among the communists, as they tore themselves apart. They simply could not agree on what to do, to the point of literally shooting one another over disagreement. Usually, such dustups occur *after* the unhumans win their revolutions. The Spanish communists were trying to speed-run a Bolshevik uprising and so couldn't wait for that apparently.

George Orwell, in his book *Homage to Catalonia*, discusses his experience as one of the international socialists volunteering to fight on the Republican side. He joined the Workers' Party of Marxist Unification, known by its Spanish acronym POUM. He saw combat in that militia and suffered a bullet wound to the throat. While recuperating away from the action, he caught the news that POUM had been banned—by the socialist government! Republican forces split their attention (and ammunition) between Franco's forces and POUM members, arresting and executing POUM members. POUM had itself been formed out of two communist factions that had a dispute with other radicals over Leon Trotsky. (Where have we read this before?)

Radicals like Orwell were Marxists to be sure, but not the right kind of Marxist. So they must be robbed and killed. This is what they do.

Spanish Marxism was decentralized and anarchic compared to the disciplined unity of the post-revolutionary Soviet Union that would last until its own suicide in 1991. The socialist Spanish government, headquartered in Madrid and thoroughly smitten with Joseph Stalin their chief benefactor, purged all non-Stalinists there and elsewhere they controlled. The term "friendly fire" does not even begin to describe the internal conflict; there were vicious street battles in which more than 1,000 communists died, falling to each other's fire. By contrast, Franco unified all conservatives, Catholics, and anti-communists with a simple message that, translated for modern audiences was this:

> Make Spain Great Again!

And so they did.

Francisco Franco, a Great Man of History

On July 18, 1936, Francisco Franco gave a radio address from the Canary Islands. He knew the time and the season; a leading conservative politician had just been murdered by leftists. Of robbing and killing there would be no end—unless it was ended. By force and firepower unlike anything the communists imagined would or could oppose them.

Franco's own words, translated into English, are a bit more elegant than our abbreviated version above. From Franco to Spain, to any and all who were turned in, on the eve of civil war:

> Spaniards!
>
> To all of you who feel holy love for Spain, to all of you who in the ranks of the army and the navy have sworn to serve the fatherland, to those of you who swore to defend it from its enemies with your lives, the nation calls you to defend it. The situation in Spain has been growing worse every day: anarchy reigns in most of the countryside and the towns; authorities named by the government preside over revolts, when they do not directly promote them. Pistols and machine guns are used to settle differences between groups of citizens, who murder each other treacherously and treasonously while the public powers do nothing to impose peace and justice.
>
> Revolutionary strikes of all kinds paralyze the nation, ruining and destroying its sources of wealth and creating a situation of hunger that will throw working men into a state of desperation.
>
> Artistic monuments and treasures are the object of the most frenzied attacks by revolutionary hordes obeying the commands they receive from foreign directors, who count on the complicity or negligence of governors and officials.
>
> The most serious crimes are committed in the countryside while the forces of public order remain in their barracks, restrained by blind obedience to governors who intend to dishonor them. The army, the navy, and other military forces are the target of the lowest and most slanderous attacks by the very ones who should safeguard their prestige.[6]

Ironically, for being remembered in the West as a fascist dictator, the eventual victorious general Franco—the self-proclaimed *caudillo,* or leader, of postwar new Spain—didn't actually do a lot

of fascism or dictating.

Following the surrender of all communist Rojos forces in Madrid on March 28, 1939, Franco became, in our view, a Washingtonian figure but without term limits. His top priority upon assumption of power was to restore something like a traditional Catholic monarchy, which had been foundational to Spanish civilization for centuries. A G. K. Chesterton quip offers a helpful frame for viewing Franco's motivation before, during, and after the Spanish Civil War:

> Do not remove a fence until you know why it was put up in the first place.

This was the counterrevolution in Spain: Keep up the fence. A conservative, Catholic, royal fence. There was no need for radicalism. Franco did not execute thousands of his own followers as Stalin or Mao did, nor did he turn Spanish society upside-down in the name of progress. There was no terror-famine in Spain, no Great Leap Forward, or Cultural Revolution. He was, simply, *the caudillo*. The boss.

As old allies in Germany and Italy fought and fell, Franco refused to join. The Spanish Civil War had been in effect a proxy war between the European Axis powers and the Soviet Union. It also served as a convenient testing ground for World War II tactics such as dive-bombing and close air support. One right-wing faction of Nationalists called the Falange favored the fascism of Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy, but they were marginalized. World War II was all risk, no reward from the Spanish perspective. The fence stays up.

Over time, things would change, with Spain transitioning over the twentieth century into a left-wing constitutional limited monarchy, with the old royal lineage of kings returning to power. But this change moved at a safe pace for the people. Spain was not irrevocably broken under Franco or during the peaceful transition of power back to the old royal family that had ruled Spain prior to the conflicts of the 1930s. There was an initial and even lasting grief, of course, as is the legacy of every civil war. Tens of thousands died. A people and a nation were scarred. And yet Spain remained. There was no bemoaning of the loss of heritage because that loss was not allowed to happen.

What Spain saw instead under Franco was an effort to restore many aspects of Spanish culture, such as the Church—just as Napoleon had done in post-revolutionary France. Now, Franco was not a religious official but was a regular church attendee. He was and remained a Nationalist; he valued what his nation valued, and that was among others, the Church's meaningful role in Catholic Spanish society, identifying the religion with the nation.

With the obvious good that the Nationalists fought for, how could so many otherwise good people fight for the other side? Ernest Hemingway and George Orwell are in the canon of Western literature. And yet they joined the revolutionary brigades to fight alongside those banning religious schooling, burning Bibles, torturing clergy to death, and murdering homeowners and landowners at random. What's going on there?

Documentary filmmaker Mike Cernovich has famously said that all media is narrative. This is prescient for the current age of fake news, alternative facts, and community notes. And it is also perennial. Leftists of old and of the present have been first and foremost propagandized; after all, the Messaging Stage is essential to their prepping of a given society for upheaval and ruin.

Just as events in Spain were heating up, leftists in the United Kingdom, the United States, and elsewhere radicals had quietly infiltrated were marketing the cause. Leading Russian American anarchist agitator Emma Goldman even traveled to Spain in 1936 to work in the

propaganda effort. The global left spun a sob story about democracy. It worked. And it was partially true, too. Although the socialist-communist Second Republic was a failing democracy—right-wing parties won the November 1933 general election but were denied power—the government was, technically, a democracy. The Spanish right were instigators of the actual war, beginning it all with a military coup. Of course, the nationalists would point out that the Rojos were persecuting and torturing their own citizens. Franco had created what public relations professionals might call an "optics problem"—how bad a thing looks versus how bad it actually is. Unfortunately, from the perspective of the Nationalists, their efforts gave their enemies ammunition in the media—pro-democracy Westerners were told that a fellow democracy was under attack, and they're being helped by fascists. One can't imagine better recruiting for the communist side.

Those who actually joined the international brigades to risk life and limb were more than dreamers. Or less than, if you know what we mean. Volunteering to loot and shoot total strangers in a faraway land appeals to certain lawless, radical, and disgruntled contingents. The pseudo-ideology of Marxism persuades those with hate in their hearts. These malcontents are easily won over by the promise of hurting those they hate. The Republican cause provided a romantic narrative to conceal the truth, casting the Rojos communist-socialists as progressives building a new, vibrant, and diverse society, the spreaders of modernity, held back by fascist killers who wanted to drag the good working people of Spain back to the Dark Ages by hook or by crook.

Orwell, of course, came away disillusioned with the Rojos. Prior to service in the brigade, he had been pro-socialist. But after witnessing the violent purges of the Rojos side for himself, he was put off by all left-wingers from then onward. Orwell noted the open lies told by the Popular Front government, detailing great battles that never happened while ignoring those battles that didn't go so well for their forces. Brave revolutionary soldiers were denounced as cowards and traitors (the wrong kinds of Marxist) while socialist activists who had never fought were hailed as heroes. Newspapers in London and around the world repeated the Republicans' lies. The screaming, deceit, and hatred came from those who did no fighting. All in all, Orwell was none too pleased with how much he was lied to in that war. Both *1984* and *Animal Farm* were written after his stint in the civil war, the totalitarian regimes of both novels based no doubt on experiencing communism in Spain. But in our view, his *Homage to Catalonia* is a more sobering read than *1984* because he described real times and places with an honesty his former soldiers-in-arms did not show.

One of the only Franco books available from the non-communist perspective is *Mine Were of Trouble* by Peter Kemp, a British volunteer for Franco. In it, Kemp recounts his meetings with Francisco Franco; Kemp first met Franco in early 1938 after joining the Spanish Legion. During this meeting, Franco expressed his gratitude to Kemp for fighting on the Nationalist side and shared his views on the dangers posed by the Soviet Union. Franco also mentioned that he believed Britain would have to take the lead in the fight against communism in the years to come. This was a fight Franco knew firsthand but would leave to others once Spain's domestic enemies were defeated.[7]

We'd like to leave this chapter of history with a story from that defeat, one you probably don't know.

Fortress of Freedom

The Alcázar of Toledo is a historic fortress-palace located in the ancient city of Toledo, Spain. Situated atop a rocky hill overlooking the Tagus River, the Alcázar commands a strategic

position that has been occupied since Roman times. The current structure dates primarily from the medieval period, with Moorish influences evident in its architecture. Over the centuries, the Alcázar has served various purposes, including as a royal residence, a military fortress, and a military academy. The Alcázar became a national symbol of Spain.

From July to September of 1936 during the military rising's early stages, Nationalist militias had held the Alcázar, but by the end, they were barely holding on, and in dire need of relief. Commander of the besieging Rojos forces demanded surrender, and they had more than words. The son (Luis Moscardó) of the man leading the Alcázar's defenders (Colonel José Moscardó) had been captured. If only the Nationalists would surrender, Luis' life would be spared. The colonel asked to speak with his son. It was allowed. This is their conversation:

> **Luis:** Dad!
> **Col. Moscardó:** What's going on with you, my son?
> **Luis:** Nothing, at all … they say they will shoot me if the Alcázar does not surrender. But don't worry about me.
> **Col. Moscardó:** If it is true, commend your soul to God, shout, '*Long live Spain*,' and you will be a hero who died for her. Goodbye my son, a big kiss, with much love!
> **Luis:** Goodbye Dad, a big kiss, with much love!
> **Col. Moscardó:** You can all spare yourself the waiting for end of the deadline and start shooting, my son. The Alcázar will never surrender![8]

Luis was shot by firing squad one month later. His death was not in vain. Franco himself made sure of it.

Upon arriving on the scene at the Alcázar, Franco wasted no time in assessing the situation and coordinating with his officers to devise a strategy for the assault. With characteristic decisiveness, he deployed his troops with precision, aiming to swiftly overwhelm the Rojos attackers and secure the Alcázar's liberation.

Cheers rose up from the defenders of the Alcázar as Franco's relief army arrived. The Soviet-backed Rojos attackers outside screamed curses and insults at seeing the traditional colors of Spain flown by Franco's forces. Franco's presence on the front lines served as a rallying point for his troops, inspiring them to press forward with unwavering resolve. Leading by example, he fearlessly led his forces into the heart of the battle, navigating the labyrinthine corridors and courtyards of the ancient fortress with determination. Despite the fierce resistance encountered from the Republican defenders, Franco remained steadfast in his commitment to reclaiming the Alcázar for the Nationalist cause. His resolve and leadership proved decisive, culminating in the successful liberation of the fortress and a significant victory for the Nationalist forces. The battle was won and so would be the last crusade.

And that is precisely what this war was. Christian versus anti-Christian. Civilization versus anti-civilization. Human versus unhuman.

In *Mine Were of Trouble,* Peter Kemp describes an incident in the midst of the Spanish Civil War, where he was injured by a mortar explosion while serving in the Nationalist forces. Despite his severe injuries, including a shattered jaw, multiple lacerations, and a head wound, Kemp refused to give in to despair. He was determined to survive and return to his home. Kemp's resilience and determination are evident as he walks to the headquarters himself for medical treatment, despite his injuries. The soldiers for Franco were humans, not like the writings of the leftists and the revisionists would have. They prevented communism from taking Spain.

The Spanish Civil War made willing martyrs of many. And that is one of many differences between the unhumans and the rest of us, particularly those of faith. Good, believing people are willing to die for a cause greater than ourselves. But unhumans are willing to kill innocents—and each other—for no cause at all.

This is what they do. And all it takes to stop them is one man who says no, one man with some help. A man who says:

Wherever I am, there will be no communism.

And he means it.

As an addendum, how hard is Spain's current government trying to prevent anyone from knowing the truth about Franco?

When the socialists took control of the government in the mid-2000s, they banned any symbols of the Franco government from public display. In 2019, they exhumed Franco's body from its public tomb in the Valley of the Fallen and reinterred him in a municipal graveyard in Madrid.

This is what they do.

Death Toll of the Spanish Civil War: 500,000

CHAPTER 8

THE UNHUMAN REPUBLIC OF CHINA: THE UNTOLD STORY OF MAO'S COMMUNIST REVOLUTIONS

You must all be aware that modern war is not a mere matter of military operations. It involves the whole strength and all the resources of the nation. Not only soldiers, but also all citizens without exception, take part.

—Chiang Kai-shek

When you read about modern China today, you'll find the nation is now the world's manufacturing hub and boasts an advanced command economy. Its skylines reach beyond the horizon and at night gleam the colors of cyberpunk utopia. The world buys everything from here. And yet China is in an intense geopolitical rivalry with the United States and the collective West, engaging in full-spectrum unconventional warfare against America, her citizens, and her allies—a gray-zone war that is at the time of this writing not yet open and "hot" enough to merit an overwhelming military response. This couples with the irregular revolutionary war the West is currently engaged in internally against the forces of Cultural Marxist-Leninists.

But China, known as the "Central Kingdom" in Mandarin, before modernization and globalization was a different place. This was the land of foot-binding, in which for a thousand years, young girls had their feet broken and misshapenly healed to keep them small in the name of culture and tradition. This is the place where for almost three hundred years, Han adult males were required to shave their heads except for one long braid in the back—or be put to death by the Qing Dynasty, led by the Manchu.

A dynastic succession of emperors ruled the period of imperial China—the Han, the Tang, the Ming, the Song, and finally the Qing. Similar to the European divine right of kings, the Chinese ascribed to the "mandate of heaven," the belief that only one ruler at a time could be the legitimate authority over all China, and that ruler possessed total power over the land and the people—so long as they ruled justly. As we've seen previously, the last imperial dynasty—the Qing—lost that mandate. The British defeated the Qing in the Opium Wars, which were fueled by the British-backed illegal drug trade in China. This is how Britain won Hong Kong Island and

built the city there. Shanghai was opened up to the British, then the French. The Boxer Rebellion was an anti-foreigner rebellion that was covertly funded by the Qing Dynasty, but that, too, was defeated by a coalition of European nations together with Japan and even the United States. Beijing, then called Peking, was occupied by this military coalition.

With the mandate of heaven surrendered, the Chinese people rebelled. There is a theory in China of dynastic cycles, and it was seen as coming to pass. And so a 3,500-year-old system of government came to an end. The old imperial system was dead; the new Republic of China was born.

The Mandate of Communism

In Chapter 3, we briefly met Sun Yat-sen, nationalist leader of the new republic set up to govern China after the fall of the Qing Dynasty. Sun is regarded today by all sides as the founder of modern China. Where there is a power vacuum, multiple factions are sucked in to fill it. This was the case for China in the 1910s and early '20s. Friends of the newly formed Soviet Union were the least of Sun's worries in the first months of republican order. A warlord named Yuan Shikai challenged Sun's rule. The republic was too weak to govern all China, and supporting Yuan were a host of other local warlords claiming possession of various territories. Yuan took over the fledgling republic and even briefly declared himself a new emperor. From the north, the Soviets observed a golden opportunity to solve this regional faction problem. That's how the 1921 Shanghai meeting came to be, which saw the founding of the Chinese Community Party with thirteen members in attendance.[1] The low building is still there in Shanghai today, and Jack visited on multiple occasions in his years living in the city (ironically, it is now across the street from a nightclub district). Several members of that initial meeting were Soviet intelligence officers, so from the very start, the CCP was a Soviet-funded, Soviet-financed operation. They found easy allies in China's working class; no persuasion effort was required.

Consider one of the founding CCP members, Mao Zedong, son of a wealthy peasant. He resented the long days of toiling in the fields. His father had eventually become a grain merchant and saved up a little money, more than most in his class, but Mao didn't want to follow in his footsteps; instead, he wanted complete and permanent change. Revolution. Mao learned something growing up in remote and rural Hunan Province: the power of thugs, banditry, and martial force. And these brutal tactics, such as burning villages, torturing innocents, and the like, tactics which cause us to recoil, excited Mao. He derived pleasure from suffering, as all unhumans do. And so Mao's brand of Leninism, later known as Maoism naturally, was more savage than any incarnation of communism seen prior or since. Mao saw purification of his people through pain as the only acceptable route. We see a basis for this in the Chinese Buddhist tradition of pain as essential to the journey of life. To live is to suffer, both physically and psychologically. Thus, the greater the pain, the greater the glory. Together with Confucianism, the Chinese philosophy that elevates hierarchy and the well-being of the family and strength of the community over the rights of any one individual, the Chinese people's ideological heritage allowed communism to thrive quickly and deeply in a way it did not anywhere else.[2]

The CCP grew in power and in number in the rural, western reaches of China and would soon come into conflict with the Republic of China, centered along the eastern coast. Mao and his followers— known as the Red Army—deployed tactics on anyone in their way, those used against the landlords you read about in Chapter 3 but also anyone who would not pledge enthusiastic loyalty to Mao. And of course, all torture and execution was conducted in public, in plain view of the peasantry, so they could understand who was in charge. With funding from the

Soviet Union, Mao carried out a ten-year reign of terror throughout western China, running parallel to the civil war against the Republic. It was in 1927 that the communists suffered a massacre of their own in Shanghai. Growing vexed by their rise, the Nationalists, headed by Chiang Kai-Shek, hired a local Triad gang—China's most famous organized crime syndicate—to find and eliminate every communist they could. They did.

World War China

Chiang Kai-shek's rise to prominence and leadership of the Nationalists began in the early 1920s amid the chaos of China's Warlord Era. Initially trained in military schools in China and later in Japan, Chiang became a protege of Sun Yat-sen. Following Sun's death in 1925, Chiang assumed leadership of the Nationalist Party (the KMT) and embarked on the Northern Expedition, a military campaign aimed at reunifying China and ending the warlord era. Chiang's strategic brilliance and political maneuvering allowed him to consolidate power, eventually leading to the establishment of a Nationalist government in Nanjing in 1927. The only threat to Chiang's new republic was Mao Zedong and his Soviet-backed Red Army.

After the Shanghai Massacre, the Communists and Nationalists broke into an open civil war, which continued until another player entered the scene: the Empire of Japan. Japan invaded China in 1931, at first taking only Manchuria, which the Japanese then turned into a puppet state called Manchukuo. They even located the last emperor of the old Qing dynasty (remember Pu Yi?) and put him in charge. At that point Japan controlled both Korea and Taiwan as well. The importance of this invasion cannot be overstated because now the Nationalists were fighting a two-front war against the communists to their west and the Japanese to their north. But the Nationalist forces, led by Chiang Kai-shek, pushed the communists out of eastern China and the cities they held, and encircled them.

Depleted and with no vehicles and barely any horses, Mao decided on a grand retreat—called the Long March. Late in 1934, he led the Red Army all the way out to rural Yan'an Province, as far as he could go. He lost 90 percent of his army to desertion, disease, injury, or infection; things looked bleak. But then something fell right into Mao's hands—a stronger push by Japan into China. This was a massive problem for the Nationalists because the Japanese army pursued their forces into major power centers Beijing and Shanghai. The Japanese rained down utter destruction on the Chinese city dwellers; the Rape of Nanjing in 1937 is legendary for its ruthlessness.

Enraged at the Nationalists, Mao concluded that the urban proletariat was not ready to lead a revolution in China. Instead, he shifted his focus to rural areas, where he believed the peasantry held revolutionary potential. This marked the beginning of Mao's infamous strategy of rural-based guerrilla warfare and his emphasis on mobilizing the rural population to overthrow the existing social and political order. Mao became the father of modern guerrilla warfare.

At that time, some of the regional warlords were still around. One warlord was a man named Zhang Xueliang, who managed to kidnap Chiang Kai-shek and told him that in order to fight back against Japan, he would have to form an alliance with Mao. What Chiang didn't know was that Zhang had already cut a deal with Mao. Mao knew what had happened back in Shanghai when that Triad gang took out all his comrades there. So Mao made his own deal with the Triads *and* with every remaining warlord, among them Zhang. No matter who won the conflict with Japan, Mao would be among the victors. The First United Front was formed to fight the Japanese, first covered back in Communist OPE Stage 3, Infiltration. At that point, the actual revolution had not fully unfurled; Mao's CCP had not yet attempted to overthrow the Republic,

merely skirmishing with their forces. But that would all go on hold in order to take on imperial Japan together.

Together. That's a pernicious little word. Keep in mind the vastness of China. Mao's forces were in the west and the Nationalists to the east, much nearer the fronts of fighting that Japan had opened up. So while the communists did experience some limited engagements with the Japanese, Mao let the Nationalists do most of the fighting—or rather, most of the dying. *Subdue the enemy without fighting.* Meanwhile, throughout this time, Mao consolidated support among the peasantry and rebuilt his army. Had Japan not invaded when they did, the CCP may have ended with the Long March. Mao couldn't have planned it better himself.

Because of Japanese invasion, not only were the people of China subjected to the horrors of Nanjing and the infernal human experimentation by Unit 731 (among other atrocities), the war ultimately created the conditions for the CCP to revive itself and take over. The Soviets invaded Manchuria and resoundingly defeated the Japanese. This set the stage for massive Soviet support of the CCP to the north of Beijing, in a key industrial region. Then after Japan fell to the United States and Allies in 1945, Mao made his comeback.

Note this: Immediately after World War II ended, the United States made it clear it was in their interest that the Nationalists could coexist peacefully with the CCP. But at that point, communists had infiltrated the US State Department and much of the US government. (Senator Joseph McCarthy was right.) These spies and their friendlies *wanted* the communists to win; they *needed* China to fall. They saw what Mao was doing, they knew what Mao was doing, and they believed he could go the distance. And so in 1946, the Nationalist-Communist unity period ended and the civil war restarted. The CCP with the Soviets now ensconced in Manchuria was poised for total victory. The United States did not provide Chiang Kai-shek with the material needs he had expected them to in order to win the war, despite having substantial assets in nearby Japan.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's last significant military engagement was the Battle of Huai-Hai. The battle occurred between November 6, 1948, and January 10, 1949, in the Huai River region of eastern China, south of Beijing. Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces faced off against the Communist army, now named the People's Liberation Army (PLA) commanded by Mao Zedong. Despite fierce resistance, the Nationalist forces were decisively defeated by the PLA, marking a turning point in the Chinese Civil War. The loss at the Battle of Huai-Hai effectively sealed the fate of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government.

The Communists unseated the Nationalist government in 1949. Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist forces fled the mainland, reestablishing the Republic of China on the island now known as Taiwan. On the way out, the Nationalists swept through the national treasury and various museums in Beijing, rescuing as many artifacts as possible so the communists wouldn't destroy them. Chiang knew that not only do unhumans arrest, torture, and execute anyone in their way, they also view history itself as their enemy.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's flight to Taiwan echoes Pyotr Wrangel's final stand in Crimea about thirty years earlier. Unlike Wrangel, Chiang was able to leverage foreign military support to establish the Republican government in exile in Taiwan. To this day, the Taiwan issue in China is a remnant of the unfinished Chinese Civil War, as the CCP officially views Taiwan as a renegade province, and Taiwan, the exiled Nationalists, officially view themselves as the rightful government of all China.

The American Response That Wasn't

There was a failed mission to keep the communists from winning in China after the defeat of Japan. That mission had been headed by the capable General George Marshall. But why did this mission fail? According to Joseph McCarthy, it was because of a conspiracy so immense as to dwarf any previous venture in the history of man. He argued that General Albert Wedemeyer had prepared a plan that would've kept China a valued ally—but had been sabotaged. When Marshall was sent to China with secret State Department orders, the communists at the time were bottled up in two areas and fighting a losing battle. But because of those orders, the situation was radically changed in favor of the Communist forces. What orders? As we now know, General Marshall embargoed all arms and ammunition to our allies in China. He forced the opening of Nationalist-held arsenals in Manchuria, allowing the communists to get their hands on lots of captured Japanese weaponry. Oh. *Those* orders.

Were the communists allowed to win? Was Mao Zedong allowed to take China? Was this part of a deal that many have alleged took place between the highest levels of the US government, begun during the President Franklin D. Roosevelt administration then later was carried out by President Harry Truman's State Department? Yes.

We'll ask you this: Was there anything in it for the United States, for the Soviet Union to be handed a powerful ally next door?

No, there was not. Not then, not now.

But what if there was a group that wanted to create a one-world government? And what if there was a group of people who knew in order to do that, you would have to cut a deal with the other superpower in the world at the time. And who was that? The Soviet Union. Now, let's say you wanted to found said globalist government. You might call it something like … the United Nations. But how would you get the Soviets to agree to take part in this program when they wouldn't have to, or even have obvious interest in doing so? What could be the dowry for such a dark marriage?

Oh.

China. Let hundreds of millions of people fall to communism, and you have the Soviets' acquiescence. A little far-fetched? Well, it's not conspiracy theory when the conspiracy is already confirmed to have occurred. Declassified communications discussing these plans all the way back to the Franklin Roosevelt administration reveal some US government officials wanted communism to succeed not just in China but across Europe as well (we will explore these in the context of the Venona Intercepts further in Chapter 9). As Senator Robert Taft of Ohio said, "The greatest Kremlin asset in our history has been the pro-communist group in the State Department who surrendered to every demand of Russia at Yalta and Potsdam, and promoted at every opportunity the communist cause in China until today communism threatens to take over all of Asia."[3] The top-secret Yalta agreement specifically, mutually signed by President Franklin Roosevelt, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin, agreed to hand over all of Manchuria to the Soviet Union as a reward for entering the war against Japan.[4] The Soviets would invade Manchuria on the same day as the US atomic-bombed Nagasaki: August 9, 1945. Russia still controls Outer Manchuria to this day. Pro-communist State Department indeed. There's a reason the US helped to industrialize the Soviet Union for years prior to World War II, even prior to American involvement in World War II. (Yes, that also happened. Not conspiracy theory. You can easily look this up. One notable example is the 1929 agreement between the Soviet Union and the American engineering company Albert Kahn Associates, which helped industrialize Soviet factories. Then, of course, there was the Lend-Lease Act, which gave billions of dollars in aid to the Soviets beginning in 1941.) Scholars who

have explored Soviet-American relations in the context of China include diplomatic historians like John Lewis Gaddis and Melvyn Leffler as well as political scientists such as the great John Mearsheimer.

So, after the Japanese were forced to surrender in China and leave, the Nationalists were left to wither on the vine by the United States. Meanwhile, the communists fought nearer and nearer to the east, into former Nationalist strongholds, with millions taken out in the fighting. Over 2.5 million people died from starvation amid the civil war. As Mao himself said, "a revolution is not a dinner party." He didn't care how many people died. He gave orders to torture people, execute them, lay siege to cities where hundreds of thousands of people starved. And that was only a paltry sum compared to the millions who would die under his postwar rule. Because Mao wanted, more than anything else, absolute power within all China. It didn't matter how many of his own people had to die so that he could get it.

All the while, Mao's CCP continued to receive support from the Soviet Union from their power base in Manchuria. The Nationalists got support from nobody. And so, in October 1949, Beijing fell to the Red Army. After all the dust settled, Mao Zedong took to the top of the Gate of Tiananmen and proclaimed to the world the establishment of the People's Republic of China, with the Chinese Communist Party as its official head and he as its brain. The CCP rules China to this very day.

As Mao stated, "The Chinese people have finally stood up."

The mandate of heaven belonged to Mao. Not because he had earned it through just rule but because none were left to oppose his claim to absolute authority. And so none did. With one word, he could order executions, have girls presented to him (some as young as thirteen), and issue any decree without reason.

And his first policy would address agriculture—the world of his childhood.

Chaos under Heaven

What Mao had done to rural landlords during the 1920s peasant revolts, he would do again in the 1950s, nationwide. This was the Land Reform Campaign, this time not as insurrection but as government mandate. He led the CCP into every single peasant village and found anyone who owned land. If you owned land, it was taken from you. Revenge was now norm and policy. Landowners were shunned, publicly mocked, and in many cases executed. Millions of people died as this was carried out. *Millions*. In peacetime. Land reform for a population of more than 300 million people is a vicious war, more arduous and complex than crossing the Yangtze River because Mao's red troops were 260 million peasant soldiers. There were those killed, then those who died as a result of the ensuing famines. This was class warfare in a battle to the death, and in this case, it was murder-suicide. And along the way, they did debanking, too; all banks were nationalized, and those deemed class enemies had their wealth—savings, assets, land—confiscated. This is what they do.

As for the killing to add to the robbing, it's difficult to calculate with accuracy how many landowners were murdered by the Chinese Communist Party in the decade following World War II, and it wasn't just landlords who were targeted by the death mobs. Mao soon realized that business owners, managers, and academics all caused problems for him; thus, he went after all of them.

But for the scholars, Mao had a new idea. He devised something called the Hundred Flowers Campaign in 1956, allowing academics and writers to speak out and tell the truth about what had been happening since the People's Republic was founded. He said, "Let a hundred flowers

bloom," In effect, *Just let us know how it's going, if you have any criticisms; nothing will happen to you.*

Something happened. The Hundred Flowers Campaign was an entrapment operation. Hundreds of thousands of intellectuals and professors were targeted in a new campaign called an "anti-right-wing movement," as any critique of CCP policy was considered right-wing extremism. According to Chairman Mao, right-wing extremism was the enemy of the Revolution, and anyone who opposed him was a right-wing extremist. In fact, it was a year before the intellectuals gained the courage to respond to Mao's call. Anyone earnest (foolish) enough to tell the truth was denounced, fired, or forced into labor camps. Many were specifically sent away to reeducation as well, where they would be driven to suicide.

Before retaliation against them, educators had complained bitterly about Chairman Mao's obvious attempt to crudely parody the Soviet Union. Under Mao, Marxism-Leninism was held up as orthodox doctrine to be accepted without question. Wider social criticism focused on the authoritarian rule and various abuses of privilege of the new political elites. Yes, the revolution overthrew the old elites and replaced them with friends of Mao. This is what they do.

In the Hundred Flowers Campaign, every person who came out was not only persecuted but sent to the countryside. They were told that if they didn't understand the importance of the peasantry, they must be made peasants. From the late 1950s into the 1960s, intellectuals were enslaved on farms all over China. And this was *before* the infamous Cultural Revolution. We'll get to that in a bit. But millions must die first.

Like all communist organizations, the Chinese Communist Party was officially atheist and banned any practice of religion. Thus, Christianity in China was persecuted as well. Churches were closed and missionaries forced out. There were not the mass murders of priests, nuns, and other clergy and faithful as had occurred in communist-socialist Spain, but the CCP forced all Christian leaders to swear allegiance to the CCP. In a revolution, the unhumans always come for the people of God, because for vengeance-as-policy to thrive, there can be no higher power or greater will to serve than that of the Party. They smash religion, remove God from the public square, and anoint themselves the new supreme lawgivers. The revolution never ends.

Amid the persecution of academics and believers, Mao grew impatient, so he took a leap. One could say, a great leap.

The Great Leap Forward

As the ten-year mark of the People's Republic was approaching, Mao felt frustrated that communist utopia had not yet been achieved. Why wasn't the communism working! Millions had been killed, millions more deported, and still millions of others removed from their work, homes, and families and enslaved beneath the peasantry class. These peasants had then been placed in charge of all farms and factories, and yet nothing seemed to be working. Mao decided that industrial and agricultural growth would be made to move faster, better, and cheaper. And so he thought up the Great Leap Forward.

The Great Leap Forward had two objectives: first, industrialize the society and economy to catch up with the West, and second, transform China into a collectivized society where full socialism would be achieved. The latter was attempted through collective communes, like the 1871 Paris Commune, but for the whole of China. The massive farms would no longer be owned by any one individual, but by the state. You wouldn't live in your own house anymore; instead, you'd live in a dormitory. You wouldn't prepare your own food; instead, you'd be served in a cafeteria. You would have collective meals, collective work, collective education, and collective

life. You would live at the beck and call of the state—if you were told to take a great leap forward off a bridge, you did so.

As for the first objective of the Great Leap Forward—catch up with America, Western Europe, and the Anglosphere—Mao came to believe that China would need to deviate from the path of the Soviet Union. The CCP must organize all peasant labor and eliminate all inefficiencies. Thus, what remained of private property was confiscated. Land, buildings, tools, livestock, even private homes—all of it was seized by the government.

The historian Philip Short wrote that officially, everyone was supposed to have at least six hours of sleep a day, but some work brigades boasted of working up to four or five days without stopping. And if there's one thing you can trust from communists, it's their labor data!

Mao was also obsessed with steel—which in the 1950s was being used to build a historically prosperous postwar West—and he wanted to find ways to make more. China had to make more steel, and had to make it faster. So, Mao then cooked up the idea of the "backyard furnace." Spare iron would be put into these spontaneous makeshift furnaces to help make steel. Anyone in China who had iron was ordered to go into their backyards and smelt this iron right there. All farm equipment in China was melted, including household implements, cooking utensils, ladles, pots, woks, pans—everything was smelted down.

With all the farming and cooking equipment destroyed, you can guess what happened to the harvest. It was not good. This one policy resulted in a famine that killed tens of millions. Estimates of the death toll range for 47 to 60 million dead; regardless of the estimate, still a horrifying time. (The book *Hungry Ghosts* goes into detail on the struggles of this period.)

Food shortages got so bad that peasants resorted to eating sawdust, leather, and manure. In Sichuan Province, there were reports of peasants cooking the soil itself—actual dirt. Of course, dogs, cats, mice, insects—all were fair game as malnutrition spread throughout China. It got so bad that some resorted to cannibalism as their family and neighbors died all around them. Parents killed their own children as an act of mercy. There are reports that after they killed them, they ate their own children. This was life in Mao's China.

Chairman Mao, in his quest for a communist utopia where everything was equal under heaven, in his quest to right the wrongs of a capitalist right-wing and imperialist society, forced human beings to kill their kids and eat their friends. This was the most horrific humanitarian crisis to ever occur in peacetime in human history. And it was done by design. Peak unhumanity. And yet, as with the Buddhist and Confucian philosophies that seemingly underpinned Mao's strength-through-suffering orientation, there was metaphysical precedent for the starving of China. Ancient Taoist texts tell of the *xiān*, the immortals who have ascended from manhood to godhood. Some lived quiet lives of enlightened hermits, others wielded great supernatural powers, depending on which story you read. There's one we find to be particularly … enlightening. From the third-century BC book of Zhuangzi, there is a parable telling of a conversation between the characters "Cloud Chief" and "Big Concealment."[5] Notice the instruction given to achieve a state of enlightenment:

> Cloud Chief said, "Heavenly Master, it has been hard indeed for me to meet with you—I beg one word of instruction!"
>
> "Well, then—mind-nourishment!" said Big Concealment. "You have only to rest in inaction and things will transform themselves. Smash your form and body, spit out hearing and eyesight, forget you are a thing among other things, and you may join in great unity with the deep and boundless. Undo the mind, slough off spirit, be blank and

> soulless, and the ten thousand things one by one will return to the root—return to the root and not know why. Dark and undifferentiated chaos—to the end of life none will depart from it. But if you try to know it, you have already departed from it. Do not ask what its name is, do not try to observe its form. Things will live naturally end of themselves."[6]

We do not have reason to believe Mao Zedong knew this parable and had it in mind while planning the Great Leap Forward. And yet the "inaction" of China's agriculture industry, following the great smelting … the "smashing" and "spitting out" of all CCP enemies … the great "forgetting" that would occur in the Cultural Revolution (more on this shortly) … and the "undoing," "sloughing off," and "becoming blank and soulless." Are we stretching an old parable about the difficulty of winning esoteric wisdom? Or are we acknowledging the ancient spiritual heritage that Mao uniquely brought to the physical plane? Was Maoism the union of Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism, given a vehicle in the form of sociopolitical revolution, and brought to life in the real world? These might be questions for another book.

Regardless, as you might imagine, all was not well in Mao's house amid the destruction his plans had wrought. Senior leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, such as Deng Xiaoping and Liu Shaoqi, realized a new plan might be in order. They asked Mao to consider economic reforms to improve the situation and mitigate the mass starvation. Initially, Chairman Mao agreed. But when rumors of a change in policy spread, there was joy. The people were won over. Mao didn't like that. Not. One. Bit. No one could usurp his connection with the people. And yet he had a bigger problem—for the people who had lived through the Great Leap Forward, the people who had endured the years of famine, they all knew who was to blame. Chairman Mao came up with a solution for his problem, one that would go down in infamy. He decided that Deng Xiaoping, Liu Shaoqi, Lin Biao, and any other Party members who opposed him, had to be purged.

The Cultural Revolution

Mao understood his own party leaders were coming for him after the disaster of the Great Leap Forward. So, he did the only thing he knew how to do well, he launched another revolution within his own revolution. In 1966, Chairman Mao mobilized the youth of China to launch a second communist revolution, this one against his own party. He held massive speeches everywhere, summoning China's young people to attend and hear him live. These young cadres, called the Red Guards, were formed everywhere in the country, from the remote deserts in the west to the great cities in the south and east.

Mao only asked for two things: unquestioned loyalty to himself and unquestioned loyalty to the revolution. With these marching orders, the Red Guards got to work. The Red Guards would march up and down the streets, going onto buses and holding up Mao's *Little Red Book*. The Red Guards would ask you to make sure you always had your copy of the *Little Red Book* on you. To make sure you're reading it, they'd ask you to quote it. Fail to do so, and you'd be pulled off the bus for your struggle session. If you were accused of anti-revolutionary thought at school or at work, you were persecuted. One such persecution is depicted at the beginning of the Netflix series *The Three-Body Problem*, adapted from the Chinese novel of the same name. A professor is humiliated before a crowd of young Red Guards, all waving the *Little Red Book*, as his wife betrays him, and his daughter watches as he is beaten to death to conclude his struggle session. The professor's crime was to teach non-atheistic science in the classroom.[7] This is what they do.

During these struggle sessions, victims would have placards put around their necks and be forced to self-incriminate in public spectacle, surrounded by hundreds. They would be spat upon, they would have things thrown at them, and in some cases, they would be killed outright. Teachers and other people targeted by these Red Guards would throw themselves out of buildings and kill themselves rather than face a struggle session—or cannibalism.

Yes, the Red Guards took the leftist slogan "eat the rich" serious. As many as 421 people were killed and eaten by Chinese communists even though there was no famine this time around. Victims included professors, landlords, secret Chiang supporters, and as per usual, the wrong kind of communists. Murder and cannibalism sometimes took place with great fanfare and celebration at country fairs, with tens of thousands of people joining in the consumption of human flesh.[8] This is what they do.

The Red Guards soon became too powerful for anyone to control, and the cult of Mao was so powerful that everyone had to go along simply to get along. Churches at this point were completely destroyed. Anything foreign was attacked. You had to prove your worth—your revolutionary fervor for the Great Helmsman.

Old emperors were dug up, their bodies desecrated. Graveyards were smashed. Statues were destroyed. All enemies of Chairman Mao were targeted for destruction. Even Lin Biao, a loyal officer of Mao's Red Army during the civil war, now Minister of Defense, was a target. It turned out that Lin Biao may have been having secret discussions with the Nationalists in Taiwan to try to do something about Mao.

Mao found out what was going on but not before Lin Biao escaped with his entire family by aircraft. Taking off from Hubei Province, they were supposed to land in the Soviet Union, but the Soviets didn't want issues with Mao. Thus, they tried to make it to Taiwan, but the plane ran out of fuel and crashed in Mongolia. Some say it was shot down. Everyone on board died.

Mao lost his mind and summarily accused anyone and everyone of secretly plotting against him. Much of this paranoia led to the famed Sino-Soviet split in the communist world, which the Americans exploited during the Cold War. It was in these final years that President Richard Nixon and his Secretary of State Henry Kissinger paid China a visit, the first Americans to step foot in the country since World War II. This was 1972.

In 1976, Mao Zedong finally died. His body was embalmed and set on display in Tiananmen Square where it resides to this day. Though the Cultural Revolution died with Mao, the People's Republic of China did not. Soon after, Deng Xiaoping would take center stage and bring much-needed economic reform to China, sowing the seeds for its later economic dynamism, particularly when globalist investors, entrepreneurs, and corporations would use labor arbitrage to cut the cost of goods sold, destroying the American Dream for millions as a result. Deng later ordered the Tiananmen Square Massacre in 1989. We could write an entirely separate book on this one consequence of China's communist revolution—that it made a nation's workforce available for hire at pennies on the US dollar. We would argue that the peasantry of China, urban or rural, needed the United States presence not in 1972 or during the rapid industrialization of the '90s and 2000s, during which "Made in China" replaced "Made in USA" for almost all consumer products. The good people of China called for aid in the 1940s. Some military assistance was prepared to be sure. Not enough to turn the red tide. This was known at the time, and it was allowed to happen.

For communists, the ends justify the means. Millions must be shot for there to be one shot at utopia. This is what they do. And the West knew it.

In 1770, British statesman Edmund Burke wrote, foreshadowing Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn:

> When bad men combine, the good must associate; else they will fall, one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle.[9]

We'd argue that the sacrifices made in the struggle against the forces of unhumanity are never contemptible. What we do hold in contempt are the otherwise good men who allow evil to triumph simply by doing nothing. That's the story of China's communist revolutions.

Perhaps the next time there is a Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, we will rally around him, give him everything he needs, and crush the revolution before it can even occur. Perhaps.

Or the unhumans will seize everything, purge the past, and eat the rich—literally.

This is what they do.

Death Toll of the Chinese Communist Revolution: 50 million

CHAPTER 9

NEW AMERICAN FOUNDING: THE UNTOLD STORY OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND CULTURAL MARXISM

Think of the 1960s. Right now.

You're probably having some rapid-fire thoughts. The Beatles. Andy Griffith. Hippies. Rock concerts. Vietnam. The Cold War. Assassinations. The moon landing.

Stark social changes might come to mind, too, ones that made and unmade the American social fabric. Like the pill. Or no more Christian prayer in the public school. White flight from cities to suburbs. The Civil Rights Movement. Of course, we don't see that last one like the others. Civil Rights meant freedoms were expanded and uptight social codes were weakened or abandoned. Perennial wrongs were finally righted. Much changed in the '60s, much for the better.

Now talk to the left. Activist, radical, feminist, reefer enthusiast. Take your pick. From that side, you'll hear a very different take on the 1960s. They'll speak of the period the way a small-town Bible belt meemaw thinks of 1776. To the left, the Civil Rights era was the new American founding—a successful revolution that superseded the first one that got so much wrong. The legacy of the 1960s was thus the necessary overthrow of an oppressive old order.

And yet something conservatives fail to understand, like many things, is that this left-wing history is actually more accurate than that of the right—the conservative interpretation of the '60s sociopolitical transformation being some vague sense of freedom and youth protest and that march to Selma. Or was it "on" Selma? "From" Selma? Most on the right don't know, don't care. Not relevant.

And yet it is. The narrative of the '60s known by roughly half of American citizens is shamefully incomplete. We understand how that ignorance came to be, so we don't fault them—or you—if you don't know the true story of that period. Most of us learned about the 1960s in social studies class, when we were assigned books to read and essays to write about the plight and progress of, among other populations, African Americans. The entire history of 1865 to the 1960s was sloppily abridged for us in school, then crammed into a few weeks. There was slavery, racism, Jim Crow laws, lynchings, more racism, the burning of Black Wall Street, then

Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King Jr. sitting down and standing up (respectively) for African American civil rights. There were peaceful protests, virtuous speeches, and dirty white policemen. Dr. King changed millions of minds, we learned, from one line of one speech, then some evil racist shot him dead. And so he became a martyr, all America was inspired by his example, and we swept away all discrimination to usher in a modern democratic society. Right?

This is all so simple children can understand it—and that's the point (note also the similarity to the Gospel of Jesus Christ). The Civil Rights era was the first moral fable embedded into actual American history education. This version of the past also shines a floodlight of shame on everything else we learned about American history prior, stretching all the way back to the beginning. We were told about the War of Independence and the fight against British tyranny. But we were also told that the Founding Fathers doing that fighting were racists and slaveowners —and by the way the British actually outlawed slavery and ended segregation decades before the US did, so maybe King George III was the good guy, actually.

Education has consequences. Fast-forward the children who learn this, and what do we see during their adulthood? Icons of early America are torn down across the country, hidden away, or melted into ore. Kids who took the simpleton civil rights story seriously came to see American history as oppressor versus oppressed in all things. They grew into radicals. And so disfiguring and destroying historic statues is one of numerous obvious outcomes.

Since the "pre-'60s America bad, post-'60s America good" narrative is embedded into the Western psyche early on, everything else we learn about American history is built onto this structure, both in school and in adulthood. The Civil Rights Movement is taken to be the most straightforwardly ethical occurrence in American history— thus, anything attached to it is inherently good or easily justified. This interpretation oversimplifies a complex event that was also in many ways destructive, especially to those we are to believe it helped most. We cannot undo that legacy of harm or put an end to the perma-revolution the 1960s brought us if we falsely believe it was all a sacred moral crusade.

It was not.

This is the untold story of the new American founding—it was, in fact, the Civil Rights Revolution.

The Real Civil Rights Legacy

Martin Luther King Jr. is the central figure in the popular retelling of the '60s. He is praised and worshipped as a peaceful activist, and he did indeed promote peaceful activism similar to Gandhi, whom MLK referred to as his "guiding light" (Dr. King visited India in 1959.)[1] And yet what non-leftists forget (or were never told) is that MLK's nonviolent resistance was not the sum total of the Civil Rights Movement. In fact, in the mid to late '60s, civil rights activism was often accompanied by those it claimed to help, with that activism many times devolving into violence (by black activists), resegregation (also by black activists), and new racism (again by black activists).

Massive fiery riots blew up major cities across America; for example, following the 1967 armed uprising in Newark, New Jersey. Tens of thousands of whites fled, never to return, as they were marked as targets by radicals based solely on their skin color. They were white. Had this happened in some faraway country, we'd call it ethnic cleansing. In Newark and in other communities affected by this era's riots, the urban middle class was hollowed out entirely, both black and white, leaving only an underclass of all races surrounding an upper class who could afford maximum-security dwellings amid and above the squalor left by a violent revolution.

Drive through any US city today to see exactly what we mean; read *Left behind in Rosedale* by Scott Cummings to learn how it got that way. Crime rose, government programs came in, and peaceful residents who had the means fled.

This happened in thousands of cities and towns all over America. Millions fled their homes and communities. Most of those cities and towns never recovered. All those interconnected urban villages were forcibly smashed. Families that had lived together for one hundred years were split apart, most never to meet again.

What the left calls "White Flight" was really state-backed ethnic cleansing.

And it was all done by design.

We can't help but see a parallel with the kulaks, middle-class Russians completely cleaned out by Bolshevik policy and practice. Deathly poor peasantry replaced them, as Soviet leadership dined on the finest meats and wine. In America, the black family structure was left for destruction, as the infamous Moynihan Report would reveal.

The Moynihan Report, officially titled "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action," was a controversial government report authored by Daniel Patrick Moynihan, an American sociologist and later a United States Senator. Moynihan, who was an assistant secretary in the US Department of Labor at the time, wrote the report in 1965, under President Lyndon Johnson.

After acknowledging that the struggle for civil rights going back to the founding of the United States finally enabled black Americans to "reach the highest peaks of achievement" as individuals, the Moynihan Report offers this lament:

> The most difficult fact for white Americans to understand is that in these terms the circumstances of the Negro American community in recent years has probably been getting worse, not better.
>
> Indices of dollars of income, standards of living, and years of education deceive. The gap between the Negro and most other groups in American society is widening.
>
> The fundamental problem, in which this is most clearly the case, is that of family structure. The evidence—not final, but powerfully persuasive—is that the Negro family in the urban ghettos is crumbling. A middle-class group has managed to save itself, but for vast numbers of the unskilled, poorly educated city working class the fabric of conventional social relationships has all but disintegrated. There are indications that the situation may have been arrested in the past few years, but the general post-war trend is unmistakable. So long as this situation persists, the cycle of poverty and disadvantage will continue to repeat itself.[2]

Persist and worsen it did, as if by design. Remember, *The Communist Manifesto* demands the elimination of marriage as an institution with a "community of women" shared by uncommitted men as its replacement.[3] And that's exactly what happened among the working poor, white, yes, as well as other races, but particularly and specifically black families. This was (and is) Cultural Marxism. It was not an accident, it was an agenda.

But we digress. The point we make on urban destruction is that it was a widespread and violent phenomenon in the 1960s. Adding to Newark, there were also the 1964 Harlem riots, the 1965 Watts riot in Los Angeles, the 1965 Detroit riot, and the riots in Washington, DC, following the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. in 1968. There were also bomb threats and actual bombings—terrorism—all for the cause. The 1969 Days of Rage in Chicago, organized by

actual Marxist militants calling themselves the Weather Underground, come to mind, though the Weather Underground would continue its activity into the 1970s. State and local officials demanded overwhelming police presence to crush the uprisings and arrest the criminal elements among all anti-war and pro-black protesters. This was to everyone's benefit, black and white, veteran and civilian. Previous chapters showed us what happens when open insurrection is allowed to exist and persist; openly violent Marxist factions were deemed domestic terrorists and watched closely by the intelligence community for many years to come.

Revolutionaries seek opportunity not only on the street with anarchy and bloodshed but also through sneakier tactics such as lawfare. A popular yet false belief many have about the 1960s Civil Rights period is that the iconic "I Have a Dream" speech encapsulates what all activists desired to achieve. This ties in with the mythology surrounding MLK. A myth to be sure but an understandable one. Already it is a myth forgotten by the far left. Did you know that MLK's most famous quote—"I have a dream that in the future my children will be judged on the content of their character and not the color of their skin"—is not included in his memorial in Washington, DC? There's been a bait-and-switch. The Civil Rights Movement asked for equality and got the laws to make it happen. But race hustlers moved in to inflame black rage and keep them down to keep the money coming. Thus, already-achieved equality under the law must be kept at a perceived generational distance away so there is always something to agitate for, something to get funding for. We'll explain.

As we do so, consider the little word that keeps coming up in this book: "equality." In every revolution, equality is spoken of in word but is never with deed. The oppressed class, organized and motivated, do not seek to be peers of the oppressor class. They want to take their stuff; they want to reverse their previous roles by any means available to them. The 1964 Civil Rights Act was one such way. President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the *illegality* of discrimination based on race, but under pressure from left-wing activist groups, that law has been reinterpreted ever since to allow for weaponized discrimination against European, Jewish, and Asian Americans, reframing this direct discrimination as "affirmative action" to "offset" past injustice. Out of this reframe was born the legal doctrine of "disparate impact," which states that if a policy at any company, organization, or institution has an unequal outcome based on race, sex, or national origin versus what would be predicted by overall population percentages, we must assume the policy is discriminatory and must be abolished—or else, lawsuits, bad press, boycotts, and protests. Lawfare. The permanent enshrinement of racial awareness in federal law.

Of course, it does not take a genius to understand that all of life has "disparate impact." Human beings are different, both within groups and between them. And yet now we are stuck with legal precedent that says you can't allow reality. It is unfair and must be altered. You may not discriminate—unless it is demanded of you. Only the activists who've infiltrated the bureaucracy may decide which is which, or rather "who" is "whom."

Lawfare and the threat of it—a hand-me-down of the Civil Rights Movement—has resulted in mandatory doublethink in modern life. We're told our civilization has made great advances far and away from past racism, which we do not deny, and yet we have reinstitutionalized racism and upheld its legality, as long as it is done against individuals deemed members of historically oppressive groups. Even that is only theory. In practice, overachieving racial minorities in the US are held to a higher standard in Ivy League admissions, higher than both the majority-white student population and others. Discrimination against the most successful is policy; it's constitutional. Holding no-whites-allowed rallies and meetings on campuses and in government offices across America, also constitutional. Allowing anti-Semitic propaganda and open violence

in the name of resistance to alleged oppression on the other side of the world, constitutional. This is the final form of the left-wing Civil Rights Revolution—everything is inverted into the opposite of what it was purported to be. What was meant to move us to treat one another as humans has mutated into something unhuman. And as a result, the new constitution that is the Civil Rights Act has undone pertinent sections of the first. We do not expect this situation to be corrected for a reason we'll explain shortly (a reason that may already be obvious to some of you reading this).

The Declaration of Independence says that "all men are created equal." We may be identical in humanity, similar in capability, and in equal protection under the law. But obviously this does not mean that all men are created equal, shall remain equal, *and* must all die equal. Again, little kids get this. Consider how we treat athletics. Perhaps you already have, anticipating our easy dunk on the radicals (pun intended). Sports is one of the last areas of American society that remains something like a meritocracy, where only the ability to perform matters. Outcomes are disparate, as are incomes, because both are based on ability. This reality blocks left-wing pseudotheories about disparate outcomes due to privilege or oppression. It's unfair, and so is life. Radicals cannot have that. Expect to see sports come under attack in the very near future. Protests, lawfare, even violence.

We've now gotten one thing straight: The '60s didn't happen without legitimate grievance driving great and necessary change. People wanted to abolish Jim Crow—an understandable desire, considering how much pain and suffering legalized racial discrimination and "separate but equal" segregation caused. But as the decade wore on, many young radicals got angry that sweeping away Jim Crow laws in 1964 did not immediately eradicate all causes (or consequences) of their grievances. And where youths were gathered, they made their voices heard. That was the college campus.

What Happens on Campus Goes Everywhere

In 1970 at Dartmouth, a group of Black Panther radicals took over a building called Cutter Hall, then renamed it the El-Hajj Al-Malik El-Shabazz Center, after the Islamic name of black nationalist Malcom X. Cutter Hall remained occupied for months on end, as the administration would not kick them out. The protesting students demanded a Black Studies Department, which had not existed previously (neither did any form of what we now know as "grievance studies"). The administration's inaction either way spurred on occupation of more campus buildings, along with huge swaths of public space, all claimed by the Black Panthers. Some critics at the time predicted that surrendering to these demands at Dartmouth—and to activists at other universities making similar threats to staff—would result in the nationwide establishment of fake academic departments producing fake scholarship. Radicals and the generations after them would take all these classes because they would be the only ones they could pass. And so would begin the permanent ghettoization of the university system. But in the age of affirmative action, such talk was dismissed as racist, naturally. No such thing would or could happen. These disadvantaged students needed a leg up. Help them fit in better. It's only fair.

Fast-forward to today. Every college has two, three, or even ten of these fake departments running grievance studies courses that actively *disprepare* students for productive careers and meaningful lives in the modern world. Young people admitted to these schools via affirmative action admissions policies do not fare well in the usual academic classes. Instead, they excel (if you could call it that) in grievance studies, graduate, and become full-time activists, operating in state and federal governments, in media and entertainment, in the NGOs that suck up billions in

funding and philanthropy per year doing God knows what, and—of course—back in the education system. Play your cards right, and you can become the next president of Harvard University.

Boom and Doom

Of course, people of color were not the only ones behind the activism of the 1960s. There was another driving force alongside them, one with more economic and social heft: the white American. A racial revolution was joined by a social revolution, led by the baby boomers. For decades, the baby boomers were the largest, most significant demographic in America, so they were the group treated most favorably politically. When the boomers were in their twenties, everything in American life was oriented toward boosting young people so they could succeed. This explains the dramatic expansion of college availability. The ’60s was the first period in American history where anyone who wanted to go to college could. When boomers tell you they paid for their tuition with a part-time summer job, they’re telling the truth. College was cheap in those days.

The advent of oral contraceptive technology in 1960 made the concurrent sexual revolution possible, separating sexual activity from procreation. The era of “free love” cut the boomers off from the moral codes of their forebears. This fueled the burgeoning second-wave feminist movement, which declared that women have rights not just in terms of employment but sexual behavior as well; there were to be no more double standards, and the consequence of free sex (unwanted children) could and should be avoided. These were radical breaks with what came before. For context, first-wave feminism refers to the early-twentieth century granting of voting, property, and other rights to women—equality under the law. The second wave in the ’60s said, in effect, *No, women and men are more than equal; they are the same. Or they should be. If they’re not, they must be made to be.* The feminization of men and masculinization of women we observe in popular culture today is an experiment begun in the ’60s as part of this equity initiative.

How did we get so much radicalism so soon? Consider the conjunction of influences in 1960s America in the same geographic locations. The campus explains it all:

1. The sizes and number of universities expanded to fit a growing population of young people. These universities needed to be staffed, so faculty were hired at an unprecedented rate as well. Tuition would necessarily increase in the subsequent decades to fund new and additional hires.
2. The Vietnam War raged at the time, and college attendance was the most accessible path for disgruntled young people to dodge the draft and avoid the risk of death in a faraway jungle. (Even though enrolled college students were not subject to the Vietnam-era draft, they protested anyway.)
3. Left-leaning individuals were already inclined to enter academia, and the hiring environment in those days was hospitable to PhDs who sought tenure. Furthermore, universities in that time tended to let go of professors who were too old, so many old positions were opened up. This allowed radicals to swarm the academy at all levels, leading to an academic culture that was and is left-wing through and through. In many university departments today, more than 90 percent of all faculty are not just liberal but identify with far-left views. The roots of today’s campus radicalism lie in the ’60s because that era’s radicals were in the right place at the right time.

The baby boomers came of age amid social chaos not seen by any prior generation of Americans. With the country's moral superstructures torn down, young people could do whatever they wanted, however they wanted, with the justification they were overthrowing an evil system. That said, structural racism was a real grievance, and that period marked the greatest deconstruction of it in American history. So naturally, public figures of the baby boomer generation take credit for the Civil Rights Movement. But civil rights activism was not new.

Civil Rights before the Civil Rights Movement

Civil rights activism had been a mainstay of American history for decades prior to the 1960s, even centuries. The abolitionist movement was a powerful social force in the run-up to the American Civil War. Conscientious and compassionate figures in the 1920s called for lynching bans. The famous *Brown v. Board of Education* Supreme Court case that desegregated public schools was decided in 1954— after about half the country had already abolished school segregation. Jackie Robinson drove the integration of Major League Baseball, but the state of California, with its many anti-segregation laws, forced the NFL to desegregate, too, because ownership wanted to put a team in California. By the end of the 1950s, segregation had been eliminated, outside of hardline places like the Deep South, where resentment over what they call the War between the States was still palpable. However, it is still common to portray pre-'60s America as some racist hellhole that the radicals had to rescue us from. This is slander.

We do agree: Equal treatment under the law is good. Actual color blindness under the law is a goal that should be championed. This is obvious to us now, but also to good, smart people of our distant past. As a civilization, we were already well underway in the accomplishment of that vision by the 1960s, a vision that is a thoroughly Christian one. It comes as no shock that antislavery activists were Christian, as were the countless leaders and supporters of desegregation and other efforts to deconstruct actual systems of oppression. Saint Paul the apostle in Galatians 3:28–29 wrote the religious (and timeless) justification for Jefferson's words on the equality of all men under the law:

> There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.[4]

But as progress continued into the 1960s, we began to see radicals turn reactionary—and stir up violent and ongoing *antiprogress* through Cultural Marxism. And so just as society had begun to see the dawning of a day when we treat one another as human beings of equal worth in God's sight, our sunrise was eclipsed unexpectedly. The US Supreme Court removed God from the public school system. The universal Western *mythos* of Jesus Christ began to be forgotten. Unity of all in a national melting pot was replaced with hyperconsciousness of race and difference, slowly then all at once. Academia, through their grievance studies, then the federal bureaucracy, hiring graduates indoctrinated into those studies, began to "communize" the races of America. That is, it became policy to treat people not as individuals with inherent dignity, inalienable rights, and altogether unique life experiences, but to treat individuals as representative of their groups and either guilty of oppression or a victim of it, as decided by the entire collective history of the group. Sounds a lot like haves versus have-nots, doesn't it? It's Cultural Marxism is what it is. And like Marxist ideology proper, there isn't much logic to it. For example, in the wake of Civil Rights, the US Census Bureau created absurd identities like "Hispanic," as if an African-

descended Dominican and an Argentine with German ancestry have some ethnic or racial similarity. Since "Hispanic" is considered non-white, we have an absurd scenario where blond-haired, blue-eyed Puerto Ricans and Mexicans are considered the same ethnicity as non-blonde-haired, non-blue-eyed Puerto Ricans simply because they share the same nationality. *You don't speak English. You probably can't figure out how to legally immigrate. You probably don't have any skills or prospects. You must be oppressed! By white people!* In the leftist worldview, racism and bigotry are laundered into acceptable discourse with all individual differences, abilities, and achievements dismissed and replaced with cartoonish misinterpretations of group differences, disparities between them, and with have and have-not labels assigned by fiat. And keep in mind that the only commonality between all peoples in our Hispanic example is that they speak Spanish as a mother tongue.

The absurdities of the Census Bureau and the leftist assignment of oppressor and oppressed categories are classic communist OPE. But the reason for them in this story is a uniquely American one: Follow the money. It pays to be oppressed in the age of civil rights. If you can present yourself as aggrieved, you may agitate for special treatment under civil rights law. For example, people from the Indian subcontinent, as well as nearby groups like the Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, used to be classed in the US as "Caucasian." But activists, following the money, pushed for Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, and more to be considered Asian to be able to apply for special grants available to disadvantaged minorities. The law is the law, so they're still eligible for free money, despite those groups boasting the highest income of any in the US.

Among black Americans, we're noticing African immigrants leapfrog the descendants of slaves academically and economically—the very people those affirmative action laws were meant to help. African immigrants and their children use pathways meant to settle historical injustices done to the descendants of slaves—and sometimes, the two groups clash on campus. Make it make sense; we sure can't.

We haven't been ready for these conversations because we haven't been ready to challenge the legacy of the 1960s.

It's time.

They Fought "The Man," Then Became Him

The 2020 George Floyd protests gave modern Americans a brief taste of the turmoil that was typical of the 1960s, but the influence of that decade wasn't limited to large demonstrations. Soft cultural revolutions of this sort have happened in all the decades since, but we haven't heard those opposed to general "wokeness" or Critical Race Theory specifically talk about it. Instead, those who do address the numerous unwanted aftereffects of the 1960s point out specific policies to be undone or issues to be addressed. And yet in doing so, they still operate within the moral frame set by the social revolutions of the '60s.

As for leftists themselves, they act like they're perpetually stuck in the '60s, claiming they oppose "the man" as always they have. In truth, the far left has been in charge of entire cities and states for the entire duration of a human lifetime and have made either no progress or taken everyone backward. They might propose one reform or another to fight alleged systemic racism in the public school system, but the left has been running the public schools in Los Angeles, New York, and Boston for decades. No conservative or moderate has done anything of any importance in any major American city for decades, education or otherwise, and yet they still take all the blame. This shows how pervasive left-wing control of the social narrative is—and may continue to be for a long time. At the end of it all, they demand more laws, more

discrimination against whites/Jews/Asians, and of course … more money. A lot more money. The majority-black schools in major cities run by leftists that receive the most money perform the poorest. They must need more money. And fewer white people.

Consider *The Bonfire of the Vanities* by Thomas Wolfe, a novel addressing social issues in 1980s New York. Spoiler alert, if you haven't read it: An investment banker accidentally hits an honor student in the Bronx, sending the student into a coma. The accident sets off a Trayvon Martin–like controversy, blowing up the banker's life with misery and scandal. Political opportunists descend on him, including an Al Sharpton–like figure before Al Sharpton became famous. The novel was published in 1987 yet reads like it was written today.

This is cyclical. We'll see a surge of left-wing activism as if no one has tried this equality thing before, they'll win concessions from the government, they'll get paid, everything gets worse, they come back and blame "the man" for stalling their progress, and the cycle starts anew. There is no self-reflection, only a desire to blame someone else—and get paid. Always get paid.

Vacuuming money from the system has been the semi-secret of activism since the 1960s. You might remember from history class mention made of the "Cloward-Piven Strategy." The activists and academics (we repeat ourselves) Richard Cloward and Frances Fox Piven devised this scheme in 1966. Their stated plan was to "end poverty" through what's now called Universal Basic Income. "The right to income must be guaranteed, or the oppression of the welfare poor will not be eliminated," they wrote.[5] The lofty explicit was not met, of course, but equality was achieved—now millions of blacks, whites, and many other races are equally poor and stuck subsisting from the welfare state generation after generation for more than fifty years now. We're not fans of Wikipedia, but their contributors write this helpful summary of Cloward-Piven's impact, which was enacted by their progressive allies in the Democratic party:

> In papers published in 1971 and 1977, Cloward and Piven argued that mass unrest in the United States, especially between 1964 and 1969, did lead to a massive expansion of welfare rolls, though not to the guaranteed-income program that they had hoped for.[6]

At least bureaucrats were able to take from the haves and redistribute to the have-nots. Federal welfare recipients more than doubled from 4.7 million in 1966 to 9.7 million in 1970.[7] Scholar John McWhorter has written extensively on the financial and familial destruction the 1960s welfare state brought to the community it purported to help the most—black America. From NPR, of all places:

> In the late 1960s and early 1970s, [McWhorter] says, welfare became "a program that had no time limit," a situation that "brought out the worst in human—not black—but human nature."
>
> "Welfare has ruined communities of other color too," McWhorter points out.[8]

Cultural Marxists. This is what they do.

So why hasn't the madness been stopped? We're going on more than half a century now. Well, we suggest the reason why is what happens if you try—you get canceled. Speak or write openly and honestly about the excesses of the Civil Rights period and the extremes they left us with, and your livelihood is imperiled. Here comes that lawfare. That is at worst. At best, you'll

lose out on social and professional opportunities. Consider why so few American kulaks counter-protested the billions of dollars of unnecessary destruction done in the name of George Floyd in 2020, or the number of lives lost during those riots. If you disagreed with the robbing and killing (there these two are again), you were accused of putting property over people. To disagree with violent uprising, to the revolutionary, is to issue tacit approval of whatever they are protesting. Further, to acknowledge that the legacy of the Civil Rights Act has been the usurpation of the constitution ratified in 1788 will result in what? What will you be accused of? *Oh, so you oppose civil rights? OK, klansman.* It's all so tiresome. We got here because the 1960s went there.

Make no mistake: The '60s were a revolution in every sense of the word. Millions fled cities and towns. What occurred may not have been as destructive as the French or Russian Revolutions, but this social revolution in the '60s was moved by the same spirit: Whatever came before must be destroyed. The old ways must go. There must be equality not in opportunity but in outcome. If there is not, it will be made so by force.

Realize that the only counterforce to radicalism in the 1960s that turned our revolution into a protracted culture war is our economic productivity. We are so rich we can run social engineering experiments. And afford them we did, because we solved the '60s by spending our way out of them. We could, then and now, give activists everything they want because we can afford to. But when the money runs out, watch out. The cold war of Cultural Marxism will turn hot quick.

Who could have seen this all coming? One man did.

McCarthy Was Right

Senator Joseph McCarthy witnessed the diffusion of communism theory and practice into Western institutions, from entertainment to government, and for that he was cast as an anti-Semitic villain, as so many of the communists and communist sympathizers he outed (and ousted) were unrelatedly Jewish or secretly homosexual, with the latter being obvious blackmail targets at that time in US history. However, McCarthy also had Jewish investigators on his committee, and these accusations were unfounded. Thus, McCarthy's efforts to protect us all were rebranded as a conspiratorial "Red Scare." They were not. Nor were they partisan, as one of McCarthy's own counsels was a young lawyer, Robert F. Kennedy, Sr. from a powerful Democrat family, his brother John having been just elected to the Senate himself. The Kennedys were staunch anti-communists and considered fellow Irish American Joseph McCarthy a family friend. McCarthy even reportedly was romantically involved with two of the Kennedy sisters.

Recall that communist history is written by the losers; McCarthy is reviled because his methods were effective. McCarthy terrifies the cultural Marxists, even to this very day. In February 1950, a full decade before the events of this chapter, Senator McCarthy announced he had compiled a secret list of "members of the Communist Party and members of a spy ring" in the State Department.[9] It didn't end with the government. McCarthy's public and private hunt for Soviet sympathizers and far-left radicals led him to the U.S. Army, education, organized labor, and the entertainment industry. Mass media was already known for harboring aspiring revolutionaries, as the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) had already shown beginning in 1947.

Believe it or not, even the great Walt Disney himself testified to HUAC during the so-called Red Scare. Yes, Walt Disney was an avowed anti-communist who warned communists were infiltrating Hollywood:

Investigator: "What is your personal opinion of the Communist Party, Mr Disney, as to whether or not it is a political party?"
Disney: "Well, I don't believe it is a political party. I believe it is an un-American thing. The thing that I resent the most is that they are able to get into these unions, take them over, and represent to the world that a group of people that are in my plant, that I know are good, 100 per cent Americans, are trapped by this group, and they are represented to the world as supporting all of those ideologies, and it is not so, and I feel that they really ought to be smoked out and shown up for what they are, so that all of the good, free causes in this country, all the liberalisms that really are American, can go out without the taint of communism. That is my sincere feeling on it."
Investigator: "Do you feel that there is a threat of Communism in the motion picture industry?"
Disney: "Yes there is, and there are many reasons why they would like to take it over or get in and control it or disrupt it, but I don't think they have gotten very far, and I think the industry is made up of good Americans, just like in my plant, good, solid Americans. My boys have been fighting it longer than I have. They are trying to get out from under it and they will in time if we can just show them up."[10]

It wasn't until the 1990s that Soviet records known as the Venona Intercepts would corroborate the good senator's claims. Of course, you probably never even heard of the Venona Intercepts:

> The materials that first made their way to the surface in the early 1990s—records from Moscow's Russian Center for the Preservation and Study of Documents of Recent History— provided proof past peradventure that the Communist Party of the United States was subsidized by the Soviet government and used as a base for extensive espionage …
>
> In the 1940s, the NSA had a top-secret program called Venona which intercepted (and much later decoded) messages between Moscow and its American agents. The recent publication of a batch of Venona transcripts gives evidence that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations were rife with communist spies and political operatives who reported, directly or indirectly, to the Soviet government, much as their anti-communist opponents charged. The Age of McCarthyism, it turns out, was not the simple witch hunt of the innocent by the malevolent as two generations of high school and college students have been taught.
>
> The sum and substance of this growing body of material is that: Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, executed in June 1953 for atomic espionage, were guilty; Alger Hiss, a darling of the establishment was guilty; and that dozens of lesser known persons such as Victor Perlo, Judith Coplon and Harry Gold, whose innocence of the accusations made against them had been a tenet of leftist faith for decades, were traitors or, at the least, the ideological vassals of a foreign power.
>
> Even moderate politicians who insisted upon the fact— and argued that these people might have influenced U.S. foreign policy—were scorned. Sen. Robert Taft of Ohio said, "The greatest Kremlin asset in our history has been the pro-communist group in the State Department who surrendered to every demand of Russia at Yalta and Potsdam, and promoted at every opportunity the communist cause in China until today communism

threatens to take over all of Asia."[11]

In fact, Robert Oppenheimer, the director of the Manhattan Project, considered the father of the atom bomb, was himself named in the Venona Intercepts. According to historian John Earl Haynes, who specialized in twentieth-century history at the Library of Congress with particular focus on communist infiltration, Oppenheimer was named in the intercepts and even had a series of code names from the KGB: Chester, Chemist, and Yew.[12]

Total and complete vindication. Everything makes sense now, doesn't it? Including why "Joseph McCarthy is the most unjustly demonized individual in American history."[13]

By 1954, his methods were deemed not nice, and he was censured—officially reprimanded—by the US Senate, bringing his work to an end. McCarthy was right; his fellow senators just didn't like his tone. The infamous rebuke of McCarthy's work came from a lawyer hired to defend the U.S. Army from allegations of subversive activities: "Have you no sense of decency?"[14] As an immediate consequence of this question in 1950's America, "McCarthy's immense national popularity evaporated" and he was "ostracized by his party, and ignored by the press[.] McCarthy died three years later, 48 years old and a broken man."[15] He may not have been decent, but he was right. McCarthy understood that Western civilization was "a final, allout battle between communistic atheism and Christianity."[16] Winner takes all. Our only regret is he, like Pyrot Wrangel and Chiang Kaishek, was isolated from the support he needed, when he needed it most. Senator McCarthy's chief counsel throughout the hearings, a man named Roy Cohn, would later go to spend over a decade working with a young New York real estate developer named Donald Trump.

In the following years, allegiance to communism and aspirations of Soviet influence in America morphed from a socioeconomic to a cultural Marxism, given the nation's unprecedented postwar civilizational prosperity. Meanwhile, the infiltration into US institutions, especially Hollywood, as Walt Disney himself warned the nation, would continue into the 1960s—and beyond—until total ideological and legal capture was complete. McCarthy warned that this was happening and caught it in real time.

This is what they do.

Toll of 1960s Cultural Marxism: 1,000+ deaths, 4.5 million ethnically cleansed

CHAPTER 10

RED-HOT COLD WAR: THE UNTOLD STORY OF SOVIET-SPONSORED REVOLUTIONARY WARS

By this point, you get it. You know how the communist revolution plays out across time, place, and race. The details differ; the acts the story follows do not. Neither do the roles. It's always some troupe of communists who want to ruin everything for everyone else, and a coalition of nationalists who … don't want that. Once you understand the frame, you know what clash will play out.

And so if you were given a pop quiz on the various communist conflicts and America-Soviet proxy wars of the Cold War era, you'd probably get a passing grade, even if you didn't know the exact dates, belligerents involved, or how precisely it all ended. What happened in France happened in Russia. What happened in Russia happened throughout the developing world before, during, and after World War II. But especially after World War II. Here's why.

Unhumans: The First Globalists

The Soviet Union you know by now went about remaking the world in their image, much the way the so-called global American empire (the "GAE") does today through cultural export, currency control, and of course, military might. The Soviet Union attempted the same, funding their multinational effort by looting the Russian treasury.

You probably know a few of these Soviet-backed takeovers well. Perhaps you even have close relatives who fought in them, survived them, or escaped them. Both of us certainly do. But what you may not know was how these various uprisings started, why they succeeded (or failed), and what they can teach us about the future of communism— a future that is already upon us, as we'll reveal in Chapter 12.

The Kennan Containment Theory, proposed by American diplomat George F. Kennan, advocated for a strategic approach to countering the spread of Soviet influence and communism during the Cold War, which began after World War II ended in 1945. The theory focused on containing the Soviet Union within its existing borders through diplomatic, economic, and

military measures, while supporting allies to create a united front against Soviet expansionism. Kennan emphasized patience and persistence, believing that the flawed Soviet system would eventually collapse under its own internal weaknesses. This theory guided US foreign policy throughout much of the Cold War, shaping initiatives such as the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine.

The Soviet Union started a decades-long proxy war with the West following World War II, after having been a quasi-ally against Nazi Germany and briefly an enemy of Japan once that empire's defeat became inevitable. There was of course the Greek Civil War, where Britain- and later US-backed forces fought communist rebels from 1944 to 1949. Greece survived, a free nation of free people, in what we consider a wrap-up conflict in the context of World War II, as British forces were already on the ground due to the southern European campaign against Nazi-allied Italy. But the Soviet Union didn't provide much help to the communist rebels, at least not the help they needed, and so their defeat was all but inevitable given the superior firepower the West helped provide.[1]

Then of course there was the Korean War of 1950 through 1953, which saw Soviet- and later Chinese-backed northern communists battle southern nationalists. The war famously never resolved, and the border of isolated North Korea and industrialized South Korea remains at precisely where the fighting stopped. Chairman Mao's son died in the fighting after China intervened. While this was a hot war, it did not follow the communist revolution model. Around 36,000 US military service members died in the Korean War. We honor their service in the fight against communism.

Let us give a brief word about Vietnam. The Vietnam War was a war about many issues, as all wars are. Certainly, anti-communism and containment were part of it. But that was not the only driving force. The war ended with 58,220 Americans dead and communist control of Vietnam. The Vietnam War began with a relatively bloodless revolution against the power vacuum of 1945. France couldn't hold onto its colony because France had been decimated in World War II. While it is true that the Soviets of course supported the communists in Vietnam, and it became a major flashpoint of the Cold War, it did not follow the pure communist revolution model in that there was no real government to overthrow in the first place. What we now know about the Gulf of Tonkin incident, a false flag, throws much of the Vietnam War into new light. For the soldiers, we honor their service in the fight against communism.

The story of communist globalism unfolded elsewhere, particularly in Latin American, where there were many communist revolutions and attempts—humans versus unhumans. These have much to teach us that, yes, will be familiar, but will also feel prescient given the time and season in which you're reading this book. Our fast-paced tour of Cold War communism begins now.

The Cuban Revolution (1953–1959)

Cuba under the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista was a rich target for a Soviet-backed communist takeover thanks to its elite classes of business owners, government officials, military, police, and mobsters who operated as an aristocracy. Income disparity, yet again, as we always see. The government was seen by many of the people as corrupt, and although there was an upper middle class in Cuba, there was also widespread poverty. None of this made the current system look good, so the people of Cuba were primed to be conned with communist promises of better education, redistribution of land (of course), and the nationalization of business.

The uprising had a face and a name: Fidel Castro, a direct agent of the Soviet Union. He was imprisoned for his first attack on Batista's regime on July 26, 1953. Upon release, he fled to

Mexico and trained a guerrilla force. One of the fighters he trained was Che Guevara, the heartthrob of left-wing teen girls to this day. Castro called his tiny army the "26th of July Movement," crammed eighty followers onto a yacht, and landed back in Cuba on December 2, 1956.

The war was renewed, and Castro won. When Ed Sullivan interviewed Castro shortly after the latter's victory in January 1959, Sullivan compared him to George Washington. As if. Later that same day, January 11, 1959, Castro told interviewers on *Face the Nation*, questioning him about human rights, "I am not a communist at all. I will never be against any right."[2]

But on December 2, 1961, in a speech honoring the fifth anniversary of his landing the *Granma*, Castro came clean.

> I am a Marxist-Leninist, and I will be a Marxist-Leninist until the last days of my life. If we had paused to tell the people that we were Marxist-Leninists while we were on Pico Turquino and not yet strong, it is possible that we would never have been able to descend to the plains.[3]

You might be wondering how exactly Castro pulled off a Marxist takeover. Well, you've probably gathered it wasn't too difficult. It did not take much for Castro to incite the Cuban people to revolution because Batista's regime was seen as corrupt and cruel by a vast swath of the populace. This is how communists can win before the fight starts—by exacerbating the issues of disparity and inequality, real or feigned. Castro, like others, simply sold himself as a liberator to a naive populace who had no idea how much worse their lives would be under (new) *communist* oppressors. Poor Cubans went from bad to worse. Cubans with any money either fled, or were liquidated.

The KGB, the Soviet Union's intelligence agency, played a role in supporting Fidel Castro's revolutionary movement in Cuba by providing training, intelligence, and covert assistance to his forces. The KGB offered strategic guidance to Castro's movement, helping them organize and execute guerrilla warfare tactics against the regime of Batista. Although the extent of the KGB's involvement during Castro's initial rise to power in 1959 remains somewhat ambiguous, the agency's support enhanced Castro's operational capabilities and bolstered his efforts to overthrow Batista. After Castro came to power, the KGB continued to provide intelligence and security assistance to the new Cuban government, strengthening ties between Cuba and the Soviet Union.

Che Guevara played key roles in both the seizing and purging phases of Castro's takeover of Cuba. When it came to the seizing stage of Cuba's revolutionary war, Che was the head of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform (INRA), in charge of implementing land reform under the Agrarian Reform Law of May 1959. The law limited landownership, took away the larger estates and granted ownership to the laborers who had worked the lands, nationalized (stole) foreign-owned land, and abolished the payment of rent for land. Che also supervised the nationalization of US-owned businesses in Cuba, including oil refineries, factories, and casinos.

Despite having no training in economics or management, also in 1959, Che was appointed President of the National Bank of Cuba with the mission of nationalizing the banking sector to give Castro's government control of Cuba's financial system. The Soviet Union provided extensive economic support, including loans and grants in an attempt to stabilize Cuba's economy. But the revolutionary government issued Law No. 890 in 1960, which nationalized all

commercial and industrial establishments, effectively debanking the upper classes and foreign corporations. Here we go again.

But wait—there's more! In February 1961, Guevara became the head of the Ministry of Industry responsible for transforming Cuba's nationalized economy to eliminate financial incentives. The Communist policies Guevara implemented led to a rapid drop in productivity, increased absenteeism, the near collapse of sugar production, the failure of industrialization, and the introduction of rationing. This occurred in what had been one of Latin America's four most economically successful countries.[4] Failure to understand the role of incentives to create a robust economy is a recurring theme in communist regimes; this is why unhumans end up eating themselves, figuratively and sometimes literally.

Guevara also led the purging phase of Cuba's revolution. As Commander at La Cabaña Fortress prison, he oversaw the executions of between five hundred and two thousand people in 1959 alone, including former government officials deemed complicit in Batista's abuses of power, members of Batista's army and police, as well as those deemed traitors, informants, or war criminals.

Others purged included Castro's rivals in the Cuban Communist Party (of course), members of opposition parties, journalists, writers, human rights activists, gays, and clergy and lay members of religious groups, especially the Catholic Church. Guevara worked alongside Soviet-sent Angel Ciutah, a veteran of the losing side of the Spanish Civil War, in forming a new intelligence agency to do what communist intelligence agencies do.[5]

Soviet expansionist policy in Cuba came to a head in October 1962 with the infamous Cuban Missile Crisis—the thirteen-day confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union over Soviet ballistic missiles deployed in Cuba, a convenient ninety miles from the US coast. Both powers reached the brink of nuclear war, but remember Atomic Diplomacy? Neither President John F. Kennedy nor Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev wanted to be the side that shot first for fear of the other's retaliation. And so the conflict that almost brought World War III ended in a quasi-peace deal: The Soviets would get their missiles out of Cuba, and the US would not invade Cuba (again; see the failed US-backed Bay of Pigs Invasion to overthrow Castro). The US would also remove its own missiles, at that time stationed in Turkey.

The next headline-worthy moment in Cuban communism came in October 1965 from Che Guevara. He wrote a farewell letter to Castro, resigning his posts as minister and commander, renouncing his Cuban citizenship, and declaring his intention to leave Cuba to spread communism elsewhere. He was thankfully executed by the Bolivian army in October 1967, finally becoming a good communist.

Castro continued as Cuba's dictator until turning over this role to his younger brother, Raul, in 2008. The latter died at the age of ninety in 2016. Cuba has never recovered from communism; society has suffered a tortuously slow death similar to the Soviet Union, their former backer. Times were tough under crony capitalism for the working class of Cuba. But under communism, it's been absolute misery for *all* classes—except for party leaders who seized everything and shared it among friends. Today, Cubans own nothing and aren't happy. Meanwhile, until the fall of the Soviet Union, Cuba was used as a distribution channel for communism throughout Latin America, as we will soon see.

Marxist Chile (1970–1973)

Never trust a communist to tell you the truth.

In Chile, the election of Salvador Allende in 1970 with help from the KGB brought into

power a Marxist determined to seize totalitarian control.[6, 7] Allende had close ties to Fidel Castro and the USSR, visiting Cuba and Russia and hosting a monthlong tour of Chile by Castro. Way back in 1933, Allende had cofounded Chile's Socialist Party, which would eventually embrace violent revolution as a means of taking power, in 1967. Allende prepared to seize control of Chile by building a militia of 30,000 men, larger than the Chilean Army, and amassing caches of weapons all over the country supplied by the USSR. To take power, Allende's supporters planned to plunge Chile into a civil war that would cost 500,000 to 1,000,000 lives, the higher estimate being 10 percent of the country's population.

Then came the 1970 election. Allende won no authority from the people, as he only received 36.6 percent of the vote in a three-way election. But he lied to Chile's congress, claiming he fully supported the constitution, so they would be persuaded to break the tie and choose him as president.[8] It worked.

In power, Allende did as he pleased—the usual robbing and killing these revolutionaries always do. Allende ignored Chile's Congress and court decisions, while his policies led to runaway inflation, shortages, strikes, protests, violence, and lawlessness. Allende stole businesses, both foreign and domestic, and land, calling his thefts "nationalization" and "land reform."

All this chaos provoked Chile's House of Deputies, the lower house of its bicameral legislature, to prepare a resolution comparable to articles of impeachment for Allende that asked the military to remove Allende from office.

Responding to the pressure from the people and Chile's Congress, Chile's military did their duty and launched a rising on September 11, 1973. Allende refused an offer of safe passage and killed himself instead during the attack. A military council chaired by General Augusto Pinochet took control of Chile to restore order (which they did) and prosperity (which they did, the latter by hiring economists trained at the University of Chicago in the free market economic principles of Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman). Chile put in place a new constitution in 1980 that laid out a path for future elections and a peaceful transfer of power, which occurred after Patricio Aylwin defeated Pinochet in the presidential election in 1989 and Aylwin took office in 1990.

Pinochet offered reciprocal punishment to the communist revolutionaries, demoralizing their cause and diminishing their ranks. All allies of anti-civilization were ruthlessly excised from Chilean society. The story of tossing communists out of helicopters hails from Pinochet's elimination of communism during the mid to late 1970s.

Wherever Pinochet was, there was no communism.

And the globalist intelligentsia didn't like that. Not one little bit. In a matter of days after the successful military rising, human rights organizations that had taken no interest in the atrocities of Allende pounced on human rights violations committed in the process of purging Allende's red minions from positions of power or influence, from which they had intended to slaughter Chile's unsuspecting citizens. Since then, in an effort to discredit the free-market policies that made Chile thrive, leftists have been ceaseless in their efforts to hide both Allende's crimes and Pinochet's successes. (Also consider that Allende himself made Pinochet commander of the army the day after the Chamber of Deputies passed their articles of impeachment and had asked the military to take Allende out; Pinochet does not seem to have planned the military rising, as has been alleged and implied.)

Leftists also used lawfare to harass and discredit Pinochet after he stepped down from power to terrorize future leaders in South America and abroad from putting up effective resistance to communism. Amnesty International connived to create a new legal principle of "universal

jurisdiction," which was used by a leftist Spanish court to have then-Senator Pinochet arrested on October 16, 1998, while in London for back surgery.[9]

In a speech to the British House of Lords on July 6, 1999, former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher summed up the dangers of the left's vengeance campaign against Pinochet for defeating communism:

> My final point concerns the implications of the Pinochet case for the conduct of international relations, which are essentially based on trust between nation states. This trust has now been shattered by the prospect of the courts in one country [Spain] seeking the extradition of former heads of government from a second country [the UK] for offences allegedly committed in a third country [Chile].
>
> Senator Pinochet is, of course, being victimised because the organised international Left are bent on revenge. But on his fate depends much else besides. Henceforth, all former heads of government are potentially at risk; those still in government will be inhibited from taking the right action in a crisis, because they may later appear before a foreign court to answer for it and in a final ironic twist, those who do wield absolute power in their countries are highly unlikely now to relinquish it for fear of ending their days in a Spanish prison. This is a Pandora's box which has been opened—and unless Senator Pinochet returns safely to Chile, there will be no hope of closing it.[10]

Pinochet was held from October 1998 to March 2000 under house arrest in London, when the British Home Secretary, Jack Straw, declared him unfit to stand trial for human rights violations on health grounds and allowed him to return to Chile, where he (and his family) were again pursued by lawfare until the end of his life. He was never convicted.

Pinochet died on December 10, 2006.

From this episode in the global war on global communism, we receive this succinct takeaway:

The mandate that led to Allende's downfall came from the people of Chile. He caused suffering to gain absolute power, as communists always do. He had the men and weapons ready to defeat Chile's military and kill upward of a million of his countrymen to gain absolute power, but Chile's Congress, and Pinochet, with Chile's military leaders and police, struck first.

Communists hate it when you do that, so when you do and they lose, they write the history from their perspective; as in the case of Franco in Spain, the loser's version is the one remembered.

Pinochet did not allow communism to take over his country.

Cambodia's Killing Fields (1975–1979)

Pol Pot is universally reviled and fairly so. His reputation precedes him, and he is one of the only communist dictators to have a Hollywood film made about him, *The Killing Fields* (1984). The most commonly known anecdote about his red reign of terror over southeast Asian country Cambodia is the sick fact that he ordered all Cambodians who wore glasses to be executed, as eyeglasses indicated superior intelligence and thus firmer resistance to the cause.[11]

Who the heck believes something like that? And what else does that person believe? Well, for perhaps the first time, we'd like you to learn the truth about Pol Pot in his own words, from a 1977 meeting of the Communist Party of Kampuchea (now Cambodia):

> At the time that we were working out the Party's line [i.e., mission, at the First Congress of the Party held in Phnom Penh on September 28, 29 and 30, 1960], Kampuchean society was divided into five distinct classes: the working class, the peasant class, the petty bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie and the feudal class …
>
> Which class most exploited the others? Which class was the most exploited and the most numerous?
>
> An examination of the Kampuchean society of that time revealed that the peasants were 85 percent of the country's entire population. Therefore, the peasants were the overwhelming majority of the population. They were exploited by all classes. They were exploited by the capitalists and the landlords. However, it was from the landlords that the peasants suffered the worst, most varied and most direct exploitation… .
>
> The ruling classes were the feudalists, the landlords and the capitalists. How could they satisfy the demands of the peasants? They couldn't. Their lies and their deceit could only help them for a time. When, after several actions, the peasants still had not recovered their lands, their discontent was transformed into anger, then class hatred, hatred arising from the class contradictions …
>
> Thus, we were able to agitate among and mobilize 85% of the peasants throughout the country. It was a prodigious force, and that is why we dared to struggle. Our Party believed in the people. Why? Because the Party had clearly seen the class contradictions and seen that the people were struggling through their own movement to resolve them. Our role was only to guide them to unite their strength, so that they would not go into combat without concentrating their forces.
>
> This was the analysis formulated by the First Congress. It opened the way to a correct orientation for our Party. If we could not have grasped it, we would have taken a wrong path.[12]

Despite Pol Pot's rant against the landlords, nearly all peasants owned land—just not enough to cover the high taxes imposed by France when Cambodia belonged to the colony of French Indochina from 1867 to 1953. High taxes did what high taxes always do—bring social mobility to a screeching halt. Peasants became slaves to their moneylenders, as in pre-revolutionary Russia.[13] As 85 percent of Cambodia's population, peasants were the powder keg at the bottom of Cambodian society, and Pol Pot lit the match.

Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's leader under various titles from 1941 to 1970 and again from 1993 to 2004, educated his people—but not in practical skills that generate prosperity, thus creating a frustrated intelligentsia ripe for communist doctrine as a means for status. Sihanouk built roads, railroads, and a seaport but let Cambodia lag behind its neighbors in industrialization; he honored agriculture over industry.[14] His attempt to ease the peasants' tax debt plight with a credit system failed due to corrupt bureaucrats.[15] He overlooked the one weird trick of lowering taxes, which would have let them keep enough of their own money both to get out of tax slavery *and* afford the tools and fertilizer to improve their crop yields. When the US showered foreign aid money on Cambodia in the 1960s during the Vietnam War, Sihanouk failed to put a stop to his military officers stealing the money and living large on their ill-gotten gains — corruption that tore the fabric of Cambodian society.[16]

Prince Sihanouk was ousted on March 18, 1970, in a vote taken by the National Assembly when he was out of the country. The National Assembly appointed General Lon Nol as their new

leader. Supported by the US, Nol ruled as a dictator with a military and bureaucracy even more corrupt than they were under Prince Sihanouk.

Seizing their opportunity, the communist Khmer Rouge escalated their already antigovernment insurgency and plunged the country into civil war. Communist China directly supported the Khmer Rouge by providing military training, financial aid, and arms. This support was crucial for their ascendancy to power and the eventual maintenance of their regime, especially given the escalation of proxy war, from March 1969 to August 1973, as the US bombed Cambodia to demolish camps and supply lines of the Soviet-backed North Vietnamese, the Viet Cong insurgent fighters, and the Khmer Rouge government. This put millions of acres of cropland out of production, resulting in food shortages and refugee status for tens of thousands.[17]

Long story short, Prince Sihanouk was against the Khmer Rouge when he was in power but for them when he wanted to get back into power, even becoming their nominal head of state from 1975 to 1976. The result was that the people saw the Khmer Rouge as a nationalist force freeing them from tyranny. Instead, they were about to find out how bad tyranny could get.

Who better than Pol Pot, the leader of the Khmer Rouge, to explain how to incite revolution? Like the previous quote, the following is from a five-hour speech Pol Pot gave in the capital Phnom Penh on September 29, 1977, to reveal the existence of the Communist Party of Kampuchea, which had operated in secret since its founding by Pol Pot and twenty-one others way back in 1960. From that five-hour speech, remember the enemy he is referring to here are his own countrymen:

> Open forms of struggle are not enough. They can only operate on the surface and do not penetrate deeply among the people. Let us take the case of the press. We could have published 100 dailies, but we would have only been able to write within the framework of laws of the state of the feudalist and capitalist classes. Thus, the revolutionary content could not have reached the people. The class content, the content of the struggle to overthrow the exploiting classes, could not have reached the people at the grassroots. It was only when we went to work among the people secretly that the revolutionary content penetrated to the people at the grassroots. We need correct lines of action and correct forms of struggle to be successful in our work, to mobilize our forces.
>
> The Party also attached importance to a good division of labor among the cadres [full-time Party employees]. To some cadres, it assigned open work, to others, work as a deputy in the Assembly, or as a member of the government under the old regime, or as a functionary in the administration, as well as open work in various mass organizations and in the press. These are different forms which can be used to incite the masses. In this way, we divided work among ourselves.
>
> However, there were some sections of clandestine work which were organized to carry out agitation secretly among the people. In Phnom Penh, there were sections which carried out open work, and sections which carried out secret work. It was the same in the countryside, there were some sections for open work and others for secret work. Secret work was the fundamental thing; it allowed us to defend the revolutionary forces and also allowed us to arouse the people. If all of us, or too great a number of us, had been working openly, the enemy would have been able to destroy many or all of us… .
>
> We were able to carry on our struggle both in the countryside and in the cities, both secretly and openly, in the Assembly, in the government, in associations, mass

> organizations, the press, associations for the expansion of education, even in the cremation societies, associations for defense of the pagodas and associations for defense of Buddhism. We could wage the struggle there, mobilize the many to the greatest possible extent, using different forms and slogans …
>
> We combined large, medium and small-scale attacks, made them follow one another ceaselessly, attacked day and night, in dry season and in rainy season, relentlessly, so as not to leave the enemy time to catch their breath or reorganize, consolidate and develop their forces. We divided the enemy into smaller units, attacking the flanks, the rear, the weak points, and avoiding a frontal attack at all times.
>
> In this way, we could attack the enemy at any time, whether our forces were small, medium-sized or large. At the same time, we could preserve our forces and wipe out the enemy to the greatest extent possible.[18]

The Khmer Rouge captured Phnom Penh on April 17, 1975. First things first, they demanded everyone give up their guns. Next, they abolished money, the entire banking system, all private property, schools, and finally civil rights.

Then they went around the city telling everyone to evacuate immediately and leave all their things because they would be allowed to return in three days after the city had been swept for enemies. This was a lie. They were emptying all of Cambodia's cities. The people had just become property of the state and were being sent to work on collective farms—or to be executed—so the Khmer Rouge could transform Cambodia into an ethnically pure communist utopia. Year Zero was announced, and all the old ways were purged—no pre–Khmer Rouge history, culture, traditions, or laws mattered. Nor did the people who believed in or followed them.

Yale genocide expert Ben Kiernan calculates that when the Khmer Rouge were in power from 1975 to 1979, they killed up to one-quarter of Cambodia's population, as many as 1.8 million lives. Like the National Socialists of Germany, the Khmer Rouge worked to destroy Cambodia's ethnic and religious minorities:

- Of the 400,000 Vietnamese in Cambodia, Kiernan says 200,000 were expelled by the Lon Nol regime in 1970, Pol Pot drove out an additional 100,000 in 1975, and the rest were murdered.
- In the mostly Muslim Cham community, there were 90,000 Cham deaths, 36 percent of their population.
- Of the 425,000 Chinese in Cambodia in 1975, only 200,000 were left by 1979.
- A 1975 Khmer Rouge report gloated that the Buddhist monasteries had been destroyed. Fewer than 2,000 of Cambodia's 70,000 Buddhist monks remained in 1979.[19]

What made the Cambodians so vulnerable to genocide? In his memoir *Survival in the Killing Fields*, Dr. Haing Ngor speculates that it was karma. No, not literally karma but near-universal *belief* in karma. Perhaps the people of Cambodia submitted willingly to the Khmer Rouge because they believed they deserved what they brought. Perhaps this was how Pol Pot won—the operational preparation of the environment occurred first in the battlefield of the Cambodian psyche.[20]

So then what happened? Well, Cambodia transitioned from a Vietnamese-backed

government in 1979 to a government supervised by the UN between 1991 and 1993, then finally to a constitutional monarchy in 1993. This made Norodam Sihanouk and the people of Cambodia the big winners because Sihanouk became king from 1993 until 2004, when he abdicated and was succeeded by his son, Norodam Sihamoni, who is still on the throne as of this writing.

Although the Khmer Rouge were driven from power in Cambodia by an invasion of the Vietnamese (yes, the Khmer Rouge were even too extreme for the communists), they retreated to remote bases near Thailand and conducted guerrilla warfare into the 1990s. After the death of Pol Pot in 1998, the surviving leaders either defected or were sent to prison, officially ending the Khmer Rouge.[21] The last trial was held in 2018, finding the defendants guilty of genocide.

The Cambodian people, despite the horror they endured and which many did not survive, won in the end. Human rights were restored. The Cambodians ultimately won because Pol Pot went too far; the Vietnamese realized they didn't need a genocidal bully next door, so they took him out. The old leadership was rescued and then made the most of it by transitioning to a constitutional monarchy with a constitution and the checks and balances of an executive branch, legislature, and judiciary. The people have a say in tax policy, have access to education, and have the possibility of social mobility.

We recommend rereading the Pol Pot speech excerpt quoted here. It is a rare and ghastly window into the unhuman soul. Deeds backed up those words. Communists then and there and now and here work to bring down the society they target, first by stealth in what seem to the unsuspecting to be normal encounters, then by violence, next by military action, and finally by genocide. When you see the pattern, you can stop it.

Do you see it?

A Long Red Night in Nicaragua (1978–1990)

Nicaragua's President Anastasio Somoza Debayle was a son of a b—, but he was our son of a b —. He graduated from West Point, loved America, and hated communists.[22] Somoza succeeded his father and brother, who had been the military leaders of the country since the 1930s. As Soviet-backed Sandinista rebels began to foment revolution in his country, he deployed the National Guard to conduct raids and sweeps in areas suspected of harboring leftist guerrilla groups. These military operations were aimed at rooting out Sandinista members and sympathizers. Suspected communists, leftists, and subversives were subject to arrest and detention. Somoza also employed intelligence gathering to monitor and track the activities of communist and leftist groups. This information was used to preemptively target and disrupt potential threats.

Clashes between revolutionaries and the Somoza government came to a head following the 1972 earthquake in Managua. The city was devastated and so was the economy; tens of thousands died, many thousands more were made homeless, and 80 percent of all commercial buildings in the capital city were no more.[23] Somoza allegedly bungled the emergency response, as presidents are known to do, and he lost the support of many working-class Nicaraguans.[24] His already strained relations with the West also worsened due also in part to Soviet-style disinformation that was happily spread by American journalists.

American academic and former Sandinista supporter Dr. Robert S. Leiken came clean in 1984 that he had been wrong to support the communists. After paying the country a visit himself, he realized he had been a victim of communist propaganda, saying, "American journalists have been taken in, co-opted in effect, by a larger group, the so-called Marxist internationalists …

who express solidarity with the Sandinistas." Dr. Leiken called out "censorship by omission," an example of which was a joyous crowd of pro-Sandinista Nicaraguans … who had been told their ration cards would be seized if they did not attend the rally. Western journalists left out the latter bit. Fake news is not new. "If the media does not report inconvenient facts, how then is our Congress, whose perceptions are largely shaped by the media, supposed to make informed decisions?"[25]

Not just Congress, Dr. Leiken, but also the commander in chief. Somoza's opposition to communist expansion in Latin America should have mattered to the US president at the time. It did not. Jimmy Carter, likely a believer of the disinformation coming out of Nicaragua, vowed in his inaugural speech in 1977:

> Our commitment to human rights must be absolute … there can be no nobler nor more ambitious task for America to undertake on this day of a new beginning than to help shape a just and peaceful world that is truly humane.[26]

This book is about shaping a just and peaceful world that is "truly humane" by defeating the communist revolution and its nonbinary pink-haired cousin socialism, too. That takes care of the human rights question. And the noble and ambitious task we propose for America to undertake is to do just that.

We are wary of human rights organizations because it seems to us that the effect of their activism is to demonize self-defense against totalitarianism in all its forms, secular and religious, as they did with Franco, Pinochet, and President Somoza.

But Carter committed to human rights for the whole world as his priority—even though he was not president of the world, he was president of the United States of America and that was not the job we elected him to do.

So when human rights organizations complained about Somoza, Carter was moved to get involved. In the name of peace and human rights, he scared off Nicaragua's allies, starved its treasury of the dollars it needed for defense by blocking its exports of coffee and beef, and when its last chance for self-defense against the KGB-backed Sandinista rebels was an Israeli ship filled with weapons and ammunition, he pressured Israel and the ship turned around and sailed home.

Somoza fled the country and stepped down on July 17, 1979, in large part because his National Guard ran out of bullets. This despite the fact his government was waging war against communist guerrillas intent on overthrowing the Somoza family dynasty that had ruled the country since 1936. President Somoza had previously identified a communist campaign to incite revolution as coming from the USSR through Cuba by the usual avenues of newspapers, university professors and students, and schoolchildren, plus a surprising new one: Jesuit priests, who propagated the communist message among the next generation of upper-class families.[27]

In a futile effort to show President Carter how the Communists were brainwashing young people, President Somoza wrote:

> To illustrate my point, I used the Isle of Youth as an example. This small island lies about 250 kilometers south of Havana and it has been converted into a virtual Communist educational fortress. At that time I estimated that some ten thousand African students were on the Isle of Youth receiving indoctrination. That estimate has now been proven

> incorrect. There are over fifteen thousand African students on that island. They come from the Congo, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Namibia, Sao Tome, Angola, and the western Sahara. Published reports now positively show that the only students on this island who are not of African origin are from Nicaragua … I felt sure the White House and the State Department had the same information. They must have known, as I did, that thousands more students were on the mainland receiving the same indoctrination program. I used all of my intelligence and verbal skills to convince the United States that what was happening in Cuba was no short-term ideological briefing. I desperately wanted those representatives of Mr. Carter to know that this was for the long pull and that Cuba was playing "for keeps."[28]

The Sandinistas had won. And so they did what all communists do: take everything. To give his readers an idea of the rights the Sandinistas seized from Nicaragua's citizens when they came into power on July 19, 1979, President Somoza quotes the Sandinista Defense Committee's Directive establishing the block captain system in the capital city of Managua published in *La Prensa* on September 29, 1979:

> The counter-revolutionaries are becoming a threat to our revolution.
>
> They are organizing and are harassing our militia, our army, and our military personnel. That is precisely why we at the CDS [initials in Spanish for the Sandinista Defense Committee] must assume the control and the vigilance of the counter-revolutionaries. As well as informing the security agencies. The CDS must be the eyes and the ears of the revolution. They must at this time be its principal defenders.
>
> This control must be carried out as follows:
>
> 1. It is necessary to have a map of the suburb where you live.
> 2. A census must be taken to determine who lives in your block. Each block must make a list of its neighbors.
> 3. If a counter-revolutionary individual lives in that block, we will do the following:
>
>   A. Locate his house
>
>   B. Make a file
>
>   C. Have constant vigilance of the identified element to know all his movements.
> 4. All the members of the CDS must carry out this vigilance and for that purpose it is important that they establish posts in each block. All night there must be watches by turns, each car that goes by, take down the make, color and license number. Every time the dog barks, see who goes by and where he is going. Keep watch to know which neighbor arrives late, if he carried packages or is with friends. Watch those houses where cars arrive late at night and take down all details. When you see someone who doesn't belong in that section, watch him and follow him so that we know what he is doing. We must not let even one movement go by, since it could be the counter-revolutionaries.
> 5. Regarding the authorization of traveling, migration papers, there must be verification that the person who must approve departures is the person in charge of the Sandinista Block Committee.

6. All persons must carry a letter from his old Sandinista Block Committee to the new CDS of where he will be living.
7. Be alert to the following:
   A. If you have a Somocista neighbor: accuse him.
   B. If you see a strange movement in your block: watch it!
   C. Carry out your night watches to watch for counter-revolution!
   SANDINISTA DEFENSE COMMITTEE (CDS) MANAGUA, D.N. September 29, 1979.[29]

As for all the things the Sandinistas seized and people they purged in 1979 when they came into power, President Somoza has the receipts. His memoir documents that the Sandinistas confiscated property of the Somoza family and all their associates and supporters and the property of all known sympathizers. More than 8,000 members of the National Guard were imprisoned together with 50,000 citizens suspected of Somoza support. Millions of dollars fled the country with more than 150,000 refugees who did not return.[30] Furthermore, the Sandinistas harassed Christians of all denominations, seized church property, and demanded clergy preach only preapproved sermons.[31]

Along with the usual robbing came the killing. Immediately upon seizing power, they murdered (sometimes through torture) more than 5,000 enemies of the revolution.[32] One of them, Somoza himself. A commando team from the Argentinian Revolutionary Workers' Party assassinated President Somoza on September 17, 1980, with automatic weapons and rocket-propelled grenades as he rode in his armored Mercedes near his home in exile in Asunción, Paraguay.

In the following decade prior to their electoral defeat by Violeta Barrios de Chamorro in 1990, the Sandinistas did what Marxists do. They. Stole. Everything. It turns out that unhumans are for private property after all, as long as it is theirs.

Their thefts became known as the "Sandinista Piñata," after the party game where children use a stick to hit a papier-mâché figure stuffed with candy and prizes until it spills its contents, and the children scramble to collect the most loot.[33]

The Sandinistas stole mansions, farms, businesses, factories, cars, fine art, cultural artifacts, historic relics, computers, video cameras, plus "motorcycles, farm tractors, military trucks … radio transmitters, shops and factories, hotels and restaurants, travel agencies and import-export offices, amusement parks and huge ranches holding the country's most productive farmland."[34] Then they burned the records of their thefts and threatened crippling strikes if they weren't allowed to keep their ill-gotten gains.

The most likely big winners are at the top of the heap of the Sandinista thieves, the brothers Humberto and Daniel Ortega. General Humberto Ortega was the defense minister in Daniel's first term as president from January 10, 1985, until new president Violeta de Chamorro took office on April 25, 1990, and where he continued in command of the Nicaraguan army. Ibarz quotes an estimate of his fortune as $100 million.

After losing three consecutive elections for the presidency of Nicaragua in 1990, 1996, and 2001, Daniel Ortega was reelected in November 2006 and began his second term in 2007. As of the writing of this book, he is seventy-eight years old and serving his fifth term.

The communist Sandinistas were only able to oust President Somoza in July 1979 thanks to the support of US President Jimmy Carter after leftist human rights activists triggered his

boundless moral vanity.

Violeta Barrios de Chamorro was able to win the presidency of Nicaragua in 1990 thanks to the support of US President Ronald Reagan for the Contras, who fought a guerrilla war against the Sandinistas. Chamorro stabilized Nicaragua's economy through capitalism.

Somoza could have prevented all of this, but the US pulled their support for him, he was assassinated, and the communists took over the country—all because Jimmy Carter was a principled world leader.

How'd those principles work out?

The Afghan-Soviet War (1979–1989)

Let's talk about 9/11—but only briefly. Specifically, who's to blame. It might not surprise you that less than half (46 percent) of people surveyed believe Al-Qaeda under Osama bin Laden is to be held responsible. One-quarter of respondents blame the US government.[35]

September 11 is outside the scope of this book, but what's well *within* scope is why the doubt? Could it be because the Central Intelligence Agency is credibly alleged to have supported mujahideen guerrillas and helped to train radical Muslims to fight in the proxy war in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union?[36, 37] Yes, of course it could, and it probably is.

Like the US military under President Joe Biden, retreating in rushed disgrace from Afghanistan in January 2021, Soviet forces were also pushed out of Afghan territory decades prior. Why were they there in the first place? We'll let you guess.

Yeah, you got it right: a communist revolution. It all started back in 1973 with a coup that kicked out the Afghan king and ended the monarchy. Mohammed Daoud Khan, a man of ambition and vision, toppled his cousin, King Zahir Shah, while he was abroad. Overnight, Afghanistan transitioned from a monarchy to a quasi-democratic republic with Daoud at the helm. His initial moves were bold and modern—pushing for women's rights and societal reforms such as, *surprise, surprise!* land redistribution. But these seemingly anti-Islamic ambitions edged the nation closer to Soviet influence.[38]

Radical shifts to modernize Afghanistan rubbed traditionalists the wrong way, and by 1978, simmering tensions exploded into the Saur Revolution. A Marxist-Leninist faction, the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA), ousted (and assassinated) Daoud in yet another coup. And so the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was born, with the Soviet Union as acting midwife and the KGB attending.

To maintain that early grip on power, the Afghan communists imprisoned, tortured, and executed all who opposed. These brutal yet unsurprising tactics sparked a wildfire of resistance across the mountains and valleys of Afghanistan. Enter the mujahideen, a motley crew of fighters bound by their shared disdain for the PDPA's atheistic and foreign-backed regime. While some were native Afghans and other Arab volunteers, these simple men united under a common banner of defending their faith and homeland against what they saw as an existential threat.

As the internal strife escalated, the Soviet Union, watching its new ally falter to next-generation warfare as the US recently had in Vietnam, decided to step in. December 1979 marked the beginning of a new chapter, as Soviet tanks rolled across the borders into Afghanistan. This wasn't mere intervention; it was a full-scale invasion aimed at propping up the faltering communist regime.[39]

In the US, charismatic congressman Charlie Wilson championed the Afghan freedom fighters, ensuring that the mujahideen received not just weapons but also a place in the global

spotlight as “the good guys.”[40] And so the CIA launched Operation Cyclone, one of its longest and most secretive operations, funneling billions into supporting the mujahideen. The battleground of Afghanistan became a proxy stage for a larger duel between superpowers, with the US, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and others pouring extensive resources into the conflict.[41]

The war dragged on for nearly a decade. Even with 115,000 troops, the Soviets just couldn’t seem to squash the insurgency. It was a hydra; sever one head and still another appears. Eventually, with his vast empire facing imminent collapse, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev pulled the plug. In 1988, the Geneva Accords were signed, and by February 1989, the last Soviet troops rolled up and out, leaving the Afghan communists to fend for themselves against the not-going-anywhere mujahideen. Fast-forward to 1992, and the communist republic fell just as the Soviet Union had. Afghanistan spiraled into a messy civil war, and by the mid 1990s, the Taliban had risen to power. That period of strife also paved the way for Al-Qaeda.

More than one million Afghan civilians lost their lives in the communist versus anti-communist war, with tens of thousands of actual Afghan and Soviet combatants killed. All for the dream of a Marxist utopia.

This is what they do.

Death Toll of Cold War Communist Revolutions: 4 million

CHAPTER 11

BLACK AND RED: THE UNTOLD STORY OF COMMUNISM IN AFRICA

The story of communist revolution in Sub-Saharan Africa has been recast as the noble struggle of liberation. There is among other liberal heroes the former political prisoner Nelson Mandela, healer and reuniter of his people following systematic suppression by white European settlers for more than 500 years. Much like the election of President Barack Obama in 2008, the presidency of Nelson Mandela, beginning in 1994, has been viewed as desperately needed reconciliation and an example for all other nations with similar complicated histories. If you saw Morgan Freeman and Matt Damon in *Invictus* (2009), you probably came away with the surface-level understanding of the post-apartheid era in South Africa having begun with national and multiracial pride through sport—in that film's case, the 1995 Rugby World Cup. The legacy of colonizer Cecil Rhodes and his contemporaries across Europe, having plundered southern Africa and punished her people for generations, was at an end. Now there could be peace thanks to the first black president. A few years earlier, in 1980, the eponymous former Rhodesia had become Zimbabwe, declaring independence from European power and influence, leading the way for South Africa.

That's the story we're told by the media, in school, and on the internet just about everywhere you look. But it's incomplete. Certain troubling inconvenient facts are left out, as they usually are when what really happened doesn't fit the Cultural Marxist oppressor-versus-oppressed narrative. And that's the case for the untold (true) story of communism in Africa. Add in the usually overlooked uncomfortable details, and the heroic drama of black liberation quickly mutates into a dark comedy of errors.

Rhodesia House Blues

This is the tale of a forgotten conflict of the Cold War.

A name you probably know well is Robert Mugabe, the Marxist-Leninist leader of the Patriotic Front, ruling party of Zimbabwe (formerly Rhodesia) since Great Britain negotiated the nation's independence in 1980. Mugabe is one of the few facts that popular culture gets right about this place and period. Most clickbait-tier education about the world's worst dictators include usual suspects Hitler, Stalin, and Mao (and recently President Trump due to the mental

illness Trump Derangement Syndrome, or TDS). But those lists also often include Mugabe. Here's how he came to power—and how he brought his nation and people down into ruin.

In 1965, Rhodesia was a colony that declared itself independent of the British Empire. In the 1960s and '70s, black nationalist groups like the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), led by Mugabe himself, and the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), led by Joshua Nkomo, waged a protracted guerrilla war against the white minority government of Rhodesia's Ian Smith.[1]

Mugabe had been jailed from 1964–1974 for his paramilitary activities. After release, he fled to Mozambique where he led ZANU's guerrilla forces in a war of liberation against white rule. The conflict escalated through the 1970s, with ZANU receiving backing from China while ZAPU was supported by the Soviet Union.[2]

According to United States Army Lt-Col Dave Grossman, in the 1970s, Rhodesia's military was considered among the best trained globally, facing off against a poorly trained but well-equipped insurgent group with KGB sponsorship. Throughout the guerrilla conflict, Rhodesian security forces maintained an approximately eight-to-one kill ratio in their favor.

The Rhodesian Light Infantry, known for its high level of training, reported kill ratios from thirty-five-to-one up to fifty-to-one. Despite lacking close air and artillery support and not possessing a major advantage over their Soviet-backed adversaries, the Rhodesian forces' exceptional training provided them with unmatched tactical superiority.

Under mounting military pressure and facing international sanctions due to Rhodesia's legacy of white colonialism, the Smith regime was forced to the negotiating table with Great Britain and the majority-black opposition leaders. A ceasefire, new constitution, and multiracial elections brought ZANU an easy parliamentary majority and propelled Mugabe to prime minister of new Zimbabwe.[3]

Proclaiming a policy of reconciliation as South Africa would a few years later, Mugabe initially tried to allay the fears of the white population and international observers. However, tensions soon emerged between ZANU and ZAPU over who would rule. From 1982 through 1987, Mugabe sent the North Korean-trained Fifth Brigade to crush resistance in ZAPU strongholds in Matabeleland and the Midlands, killing thousands of Ndebele civilians in what became known as the Gukurahundi massacres. Revolutionaries always eat their own.[4] Having neutralized his main rival Nkomo and ZAPU, Mugabe further consolidated power, becoming president and declaring ZANU the only legal political party. He then put equity into action regarding the white African population.[5]

Now, *equity* differs from *equality* in the insidious way you learned in Chapter 9. Remember the disparate impact doctrine of Cultural Marxism? Mugabe and ZAPU made it national policy. Consider land reform. Equality under the law would have allowed both white and black farmers legal standing to purchase and manage land for agricultural and other purposes. Equality is what unhumans say they want; whenever they win the chance to create it, they destroy all hope of equality. Instead, they drive for equity.

Disparate ownership of farmland in Zimbabwe was deemed unacceptable. Only 3 percent of the population-at-large had been white; yet whites owned 51 percent of farmland.[6] Thus, in the Cultural Marxist frame of Mugabe, the disparate impact needed to be correct—blacks should have owned 97 percent of the farmland, not 51 percent.

And so Mugabe's regime followed the same subversive plan of his predecessors Mao and Stalin—he ordered prosperous and profitable farms seized from capable whites and redistributed

to black families, many of whom had neither the knowledge, nor the skill, nor the experience running a modern industrial farm. And yet this was only "fair," as seen through the Cultural Marxist lens.

You may have seen occasional memes online mocking the Zimbabwean currency, notable for its $100 trillion notes, highest of any nationally issued currency in the world. A loaf of bread cost 300 billion Zimbabwean dollars. There's hyperinflation and then there's whatever the hell that was. In any case, the economic annihilation of Zimbabwe and the collapse of its agricultural productivity were direct results of anti-white land reform. And as is usually the case, when the unhumans come, they leave their victims without property, liberty, and life. White farmers whose families had worked the same land for generations were forced off their own property without any national or international legal recourse, yes, and of course, some less-than-enthusiastic farmers were murdered. By the early 2000s, most of the remaining white population had been ethnically cleansed, either slaughtered outright in semilegal white genocide, or driven off their land and expelled to South Africa. Cultural Marxism has consequences.[7]

Mugabe was finally ousted in a 2017 coup after four decades in power, but the revolution he'd forced his people into went nowhere. Modern-day Zimbabwe still fails the human rights check even and particularly among the black population. After all dissenting political parties were outlawed, a new "Patriotic Bill" eliminated free speech and freedom of association, instituting punishment for unapproved speech, particularly (well-earned) criticism of the government. Enemies of the state are arrested, tortured, and held in prison for years without bail or trial. The overwhelming majority of these victims are black. There are also plans for more tolls, levies, and taxes so all Zimbabweans are burdened, not just the most vocal among them.[8] (Do we have to say it? We do.)

This is what they do.

"Kill the Boer": New Apartheid in South Africa

The apartheid policy of South Africa mirrored that of Jim Crow in southern US states in multiple ways, racial segregation being the most obvious. The history of communist movements throughout the world has in times and places been shown to have real moral rot it attempted to extricate. In white South African society, blacks were second-class citizens; inequality under the law *was* the law. Rhodesia-turned-Zimbabwe told a similar story. And again, in South Africa as there, the goal of equality was not assigned a practical system to achieve it. Instead, the Cultural Marxists pushed right past it and plunged the country into a downward equity spiral. And that's not even taking to account the fact that avowed communist Nelson Mandela, darling of the Western progressive elite, had been justly imprisoned for actual crimes, which as President Ronald Reagan put it in 1986, included "calculated terror … the mining of roads, the bombings of public places, designed to bring about further repression."[9] Yet another character sanitized for the affluent, like Che Guevara and others before him. (Look up "South Africa necklacing," if you don't believe us.)

The struggle against white South African rule stretched back many decades; the seeds of sudden uprising were often sown long prior, even before the eventual belligerents in revolutionary war were born. The African National Congress (ANC), founded in 1912, initially pursued a strategy of nonviolent resistance against segregation. However, the hardening of apartheid policies in the 1950s and the Sharpeville Massacre of 1960, where police killed sixty-nine mostly peaceful protesters, convinced many that more militant action was needed.[10] In

1961, ANC leaders such as Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu formed *Umkhonto we Sizwe* (MK), the armed wing of the liberation movement. MK was given military and financial support by the Soviet Union, including training for ANC fighters by the KGB. MK launched a sabotage campaign President Reagan would later scorn. But Mandela was captured in 1962 and sentenced to life in prison for treason.[11] Other top ANC leaders like Oliver Tambo and Joe Slovo went into exile and directed the struggle from abroad.

The next major watershed came after the Soweto Uprising of 1976, when police killed hundreds of students protesting the teaching of Afrikaans, a white African language, in schools. The unnecessary brutality of the government response fueled massive resistance and a new generation of activists like Steve Biko, who helped found the militant Black Consciousness Movement.[12] The state cracked down harder, banning opposition groups and detained thousands. Biko was arrested and beaten to death in police custody in 1977, becoming a martyr of the anti-apartheid cause. Radicals then and now begin their work by rallying people with actual, genuine grievances; black South Africans had plenty, thus, violent resistance felt justified.

Through the 1980s, unrest spread as the United Democratic Front and other grassroots organizations made much of the country ungovernable. MK and the Azanian People's Liberation Army (APLA), the armed wing of the Pan-Africanist Congress, intensified their guerrilla campaigns and bombings of military and government targets.[13]

Facing a spiraling crisis, escalating international pressure, and the end of the Cold War, the apartheid regime was finally forced to the negotiating table. In 1990, white South African President F. W. de Klerk unbanned opposition groups and released Mandela and other political prisoners. After difficult talks and continued violence by diehard elements on both sides, a settlement was reached for a transition to majority rule. The ANC won an overwhelming victory in the 1994 elections, making Mandela the country's first black president.[14]

Everything thereafter was kumbaya, right? Wrong! Radical black South Africans, now with the political power they'd bitterly sought for decades, replaced the old racial caste system with a New Apartheid rather than merit-based laws. You can guess by now what that means: land reform! In post-apartheid South Africa, farms were seized from white owners by coercion and by force. The idea was to address historical inequalities and redistribute land to black South Africans affected by apartheid. And so the have-nots robbed the haves. They killed, too. To this day, horrific crimes against humanity stain South Africa's name at home and abroad, with numerous reports of black gangs kidnapping and torturing white farmers to death, squatting on their land, and stripping the property bare to resell the parts for scrap. This is late-stage Cultural Marxism. It will probably get worse before it gets better. We've both done business with white South Africans; they've casually mentioned the goings-on of daily life: self-segregating for their own personal safety, owning (and occasionally having to use) firearms, hiring 24/7 private security, and staying as close to their private gated communities and near-maximum-security compounds. It's just not safe to be white, in certain areas. The unhuman press denigrates South Africans for taking such measures, with one particular outlet lashing white South Africans as "oppressors" who once felt "so safe," celebrating the fact that many no longer do (or are).[15] Trying to protect yourself from roving terror mobs intent on robbing and killing you is racist, to the unhuman. Unfortunately, revolutionaries in the United States are intent on re-creating that New Apartheid domestically. This is only "fair."

How is South Africa doing after they wrote racial quotas into their new constitution? The electrical grid is now failing across the country as of the time of this writing.

Let's close this brief yet sobering chapter with a preview of our own possible future in the West (for among other reasons because by now you've gotten the full picture—unhumans pull the same tricks whenever and wherever they go; you don't need encyclopedic detail). Far-left anti-white activist Julius Malema is known for preaching (and singing) hate toward white South Africans. A clip of Malema leading a packed stadium of thousands of black South Africans singing, "Kill the Boer," referring to white South African descendants of seventeenth century Dutch settlers, went viral during our initial research for this book. Malema has been described by former president Jacob Zuma among other prominent South Africans as a future national leader.[16] Moderates are less bullish on his odds, as his antics are terrible for a country with already worst-in-class public relations.[17] One of Malema's ambitions is, of course, *more* land reform—even more mandatory relinquishment of white-owned land across South Africa to the black population. He is popular.[18]

Most telling with regard to his future is how his open call for violence toward whites has been well-received (and acted upon) by young blacks under his influence—and how Western press interprets those remarks. Whereas a maligned figure like former President Donald J. Trump has metaphorical language like a "bloodbath" occurring in the American auto industry twisted into a literal promise of violence, Malema's actual call to literally kill was interpreted in the brightest of possible lights.[19] No, Malema was not calling for actual killing when he said, "kill," wrote the *New York Times*, and those who took him at his word are "far-right."[20] The absurdity only makes sense when we realize the oppressor-versus-oppressed frame has been applied.

For black revolutionaries to call for the killing of whites is mere misbehavior, tradition, they don't know any better. But for you to not want white people murdered is extremism.

This is what they do.

Death Toll of Communism in Africa: 50,000+ deaths, 1.5 million ethnically cleansed

CHAPTER 12

INSURRECTION AND THE IRREGULAR REVOLUTION

> *A revolution is not a dinner party, or writing an essay, or painting a picture, or doing embroidery ... revolution is an insurrection, an act of violence by which one class overthrows another.*
>
> —Mao Zedong

Unhumans is far from a complete history of the communist revolution in all times and places. We could have covered the 1919 communist revolt in Berlin, Germany; the Soviet-supported Mongolian Revolution of 1921; and the extended Laotian Civil War, stretching from 1959 to 1975, that replaced the monarchy with communism, to name but three. There are so many stories we could tell. Alas, this is a book, not an encyclopedia; an overview, not a reference work. This is for the best, in our view. Because knowing what the unhumans do with the weapon of terror and the absolute power it brings them is not enough. And so additional coverage of communist history and depth of detail into it does not give us what we need next: what to do about it. Specifically, the knowledge, the resources, and the will to **crush** the revolution, wherever and whenever it occurs, even *before* it can occur. The past offers us myriad lessons. What Chapter 3 offered as preview—how to stop the left when they go too far—we now give you a fuller review. Before we get into that, we must address the lingering question some of you still have:

SO WHAT?

Yes. So what that the Roman plebeians got along poorly under the patricians. So what that French peasants occupied an old castle. That two Germans named Marx and Engels wrote a little book most modern people have never read. Or that Russia, China, and Spain shed their own blood in bitter internal conflicts. That's just civil war. History offers plenty of examples of those. So what? Do we *really* see any situations in modern times playing out (or starting to) just like the Bastille, Ipatiev House, or the Great Leap Forward?

Well, there does seem to be a lot of that Operational Preparation of the Environment for Revolution going on, with regard to separating, messaging, and infiltrating. Chapter 3 offered several bloody examples. And as for direct parallels between past and present, a recent example in twenty-first-century America is that online activists have seized administrative and moderation

control over most major US social media platforms. The right to free speech has been suspended by nonelected actors, while actual representatives of the citizenry do nothing about it but appear on friendly TV networks pointing out leftist hypocrisy, encourage us to "imagine if the situations were reversed," and write sternly worded letters that nobody reads.

Meanwhile, the secret e-police operate the way Friends of the Soviet Union and other Soviet propagandists did to interact with individuals, groom the vulnerable ones, cancel the uppity ones, then form the most radical into mobs, as David Kowalski describes in *Stalin and the Spanish Civil War*. Near-identical social media manipulation by radicals is well-documented in among other places the Twitter Files, as released by Elon Musk, and yet has gone not at all well-retaliated against.[1]

OK, that parallel is a gimme. More are as easy to find. Already we've documented more throughout this book. But is this an exercise in logical fallacy? Are we confirming a conclusion decided in advance, then failing to introduce any evidence to the contrary? Is this all— *gasp*—a CONSPIRACY THEORY?!

These objections are fair. If you were to tell a neighbor or friend that any of this secret communist stuff means we're about to have a *Red Dawn* scenario, they'll ask if you polished your tinfoil hat today. We can't *really* be serious about a coming American Bastille, Neo-Bolshevism, or One Giant Leap Forward for All Mankind pushed by the WEF … can we? After all, most Americans and other Westerners have it OK. We're nowhere close to the techno-paradise of flying cars and freedom cities promised by 1950s futurism. But ask any one person on the streets, at work, or in church how they're doing and they'll tell you "fine." Most people can afford a place to live, at least one car that works most of the time, and near-food products for three square meals a day.

And yet something is off. In 1999, 71 percent of Americans felt "satisfaction" with the way things were going overall. Twenty-five years later, that's fallen to 19 percent.[2] Life-course trajectories are lower now, too. Hopes, more pragmatic; expectations, sobering. We've realized that the great American dream was a promise with an expiration date. The internet and all its conveniences could not keep globalization from smashing the American producer economy into a crater of consumption.

Something is deeply wrong with the way things are going and you know it. You may not be able to explain it with studies, surveys, or statistics, but you feel it. You've felt this way for a while. Like there's some outside force or group or … *something* … that's sent us all off course from the libertarian utopia we should've achieved by now. It doesn't seem like one -ism or -ation is entirely to blame, like globalism or immigration, capitalism or inflation.

The past makes sense of the present. Evidence of the unhuman activity is everywhere we look. But can we really pin all those on communists? Nobody pays attention to CPUSA. And there hasn't been a Carmelite nun–style massacre. Or mass arrest and torture of landlords. But they're arresting landlords in New York City, now. And yet … the history of the revolution … the present day … it feels directionally accurate, doesn't it? We don't want to hindcast or weave a convenient web of unrelated facts into a narrative that can't hold the weight of two or three fact checks. Still, you can't help but *notice*. Are others noticing, too? Is it just you? This demoralization, the demonetization, the demoting and demonizing. It's real. All of it. Yet none of the authorities in charge of responding to real threats, foreign and domestic, seem to be doing anything. Not even talking about it, really. All rhetoric and funding is focused on endless overseas wars and whatever controversy the latest conservative public figure caused with a quote taken out of context. Meanwhile, things are getting worse, and it's as if we're not allowed to talk

about why.

Yes. You're on to something. What feels like is there, *is* there. And "it" is good at organizing and also at staying undetected. Moving below the radar. Operating in secret.

The terrible truth is that there is a distinct revolutionary movement we are witnessing in the modern-day West, one directly and indirectly responsible for all that demoralizing and demeaning. And yet it's different from previous uprisings in visibility, publicity, and intensity. It is a revolution nonetheless and follows the same arc as every unhuman story does. It is:

The Irregular Communist Revolution

If you don't understand gray zone warfare, you don't know what's going on. From the Atlantic Council:

> The gray zone describes a set of activities that occur between peace (or cooperation) and war (or armed conflict). A multitude of activities fall into this murky in-between—from nefarious economic activities, influence operations, and cyberattacks to mercenary operations, assassinations, and disinformation campaigns. Generally, gray-zone activities are considered gradualist campaigns by state and non-state actors that combine non-military and quasi-military tools and fall below the threshold of armed conflict. They aim to thwart, destabilize, weaken, or attack an adversary, and they are often tailored toward the vulnerabilities of the target state.[3]

Put another way, a gray zone war is fought in ways that *fail* to provoke an organized, tit-for-tat response from the target. When you're a gray zone warrior, they let you do it. You can do anything. On the international stage, the twenty-first-century Chinese Communist Party has achieved gray zone mastery, waging an irregular yet full-spectrum war against the United States, Europe, and Western allies throughout southeast Asia, from manufacturing fentanyl to kill unsuspecting American teenagers, to sending Chinese fishing boats into international waters with naval escorts to ward off other countries.

History does not repeat, but it sure as hell rhymes. What unhumans do anywhere, they do everywhere. And so the best frame for understanding the nearly universal malaise and low-intensity misery most Americans feel is this one:

We are suffering through an Irregular Communist Revolution.

Specifically, the Irregular Communist Revolution in the late-state republic West is a Cultural Marxist revolution—the targets are social and cultural, not economic. Just as military war has changed, so has revolutionary warfare. In gray zone conflicts, there is no distinction between civilian and combatant.[4] Established international human rights separating the two are thus undone.[5] Unhuman. This is what they do.

In the United States and throughout the West, the Cultural Marxist mental model of oppressor versus oppressed has separated the sociopolitical haves from the have-nots. This effort was begun in the 1960s in academia and has proven successful in all mainstream institutions. The dominant decision-making process of every major organization, public and private, now demands elevation of the alleged oppressed with subjection of the accused oppressor. This is what it means to be "woke," by the way. *Woke* is shorthand for this lens through which you view: that all interactions, from everyday relationships to passing encounters to any conflicts along the way, are all intersections between someone of an oppressed class and someone of an

oppressor class. Like classical Marxism, which cast *any* proletariat individual as a representative of *all* proletariats and *any* bourgeois as a representative of *all* bourgeois, woke unhumans the soul, turning people into labels with inherent value or disvalue. But it does so in a cultural rather than socioeconomic context—Cultural Marxism. By the way, "oppressed" and "oppressor" are misnomers, as actual evidence of oppression is not a prerequisite to wearing the label with pride. If someone of your race, gender, orientation, nationality, or other group experienced prejudice at some point in the past, then the "benefits" of that oppression are bequeathed to anyone taking up that label with pride (or comedic irony, hence the occasional obviously white person who identifies as black). Claims of that identity are enough as are assertions of oppression. The reason why is obvious: unhumans organize. They need as many people with them, not against them, as possible. The bar is low.

Operational preparation of all American environments via the separation, message, and infiltration stages are complete. And so we are all subjected to the communist revolution, fought and won in the gray zone, without the authorities recognizing this threat for what it is going on sixty-plus years now. The inciting, the seizing, and the purging—the three acts the revolution follows—do not usually take place in open-air environments with great concentrations of people, as they did in Russia, Spain, and China, with one recent notable exception: January 6, 2021.

January 6, 2021: America's Inverse Bastille

After watching radical mobs burn and loot without consequence in the summer of 2020, supporters of then-President Donald J. Trump thought they could freely protest what in their view was a sketchy election result, with Trump losing to former Vice President Joseph Biden following an unprecedented nighttime suspension of vote counting in key states and precincts, with Biden miraculously leapfrogging Trump immediately after vote-counting resumed. Elections in the United States are supposed to be free and fair; these well-meaning patriots believed they could and should speak truth to power on power's home turf—the US Capitol.

On January 6, 2021, thousands of conservatives walked into a lawfare trap used to destroy them and make them an example to any other Republicans who want to get uppity in the future. Entrapment has been a tool of subversion all the way back to Mao and the Hundred Flowers Campaign. The leftist press officially called the protest an "insurrection." In terms of the violence on the steps, and there certainly was, it is clear the guards fired on a peaceful crowd with nonlethal munitions and flash-bangs. One of our authors, Jack Posobiec, was an in-person eyewitness to the flashbangs thrown into a peaceful crowd. That is what set everything off. The demonstration was not an insurrection. The insurrection hoax was used to begin a purge of Trump supporters from the military and from public life. This was an inverse Bastille; in the French Revolution, subversives attacked a government building to begin the purge of their enemies. In Washington, the subversives purged their enemies by means of the opposite, by luring them into a government building. It worked; a revolt against a largely law-abiding and nonviolent group of patriotic citizens and influencers on the American right had begun. It has been both brutal and total. Fortunes have been drained, accounts seized, and parents imprisoned away from their children with unusually long sentences for upgraded charges, the penalties for which did not fit the crime, which in most cases consisted of quietly walking around public property taking photos, escorted inside and around by police and other security. The have even convicted a praying grandmother. Going after religious women—sounds familiar.

Remember, the rhetoric is all just window dressing. What they do is what matters. The locking up of patriots was always the goal. This is what they do.

It was all a trap. President Trump possibly saw it for what it was and had preauthorized 10,000 National Guard troops to maintain law and order, protecting peaceful protesters from escalation by possible threats, federal informants, and planned agitators. Washington, DC, Mayor Muriel Bowser rejected the help, accepting only 350 and on a limited capacity.[6]

National Guard testimony later revealed that on the afternoon of January 6, 2021, the available DC National Guard were still "not allowed" to do their job "due to paralyzed decision-making by acting Secretary of Defense Chris Miller and Secretary of the Army Ryan McCarthy… . This led to a crisis in federal leadership at the Pentagon and delayed the DC response by 3 hours and 19 minutes."[7] The Commander-in-Chief's wishes had gone unfulfilled to his and to the nation's detriment; in any other situation, this would be described as a joint political and military coup d'état.

There was indeed an insurrection on January 6, 2021—against President Trump and his supporters. That is not even to mention the questionable election results; three in ten Americans believe Biden won the 2020 election only through fraud, with six in ten Republicans believing such.[8, 9] Of course, claims of fraud were roundly rejected by mainstream experts on both sides—before investigations were conducted. Rasmussen Reports has since published extensive research and findings of meaningful anomalies and even "documented fraud."[10] These findings were never given a constitutionally provided hearing in the Senate on Jan 6.

The known facts now exonerate the January 6 protesters. And yet relentless pursuit of nonviolent attendees continues unabated. The federal government has gone full Zimbabwe on President Trump supporters, with political persecution for as many associated with the former president as they could reach. The victims of unseemly, unethical prosecution in Zimbabwe are black; most of those in the United States, white. As the Cultural Marxism frame predicts, Human Rights Watch advocates for the imperiled citizens of Zimbabwe and condemns the political prisoners in America, smearing all January 6 events participants as radical far-right and racist—and well-deserving of persecution.[11] Human Rights Watch also falsely accused the majority-peaceful assembly in the US Capitol for "deaths … of security personnel."[12] This is not correct. The only individual killed during the January 6, 2021 protest and *specifically as a result* of the protest was, in fact, a protester—U.S. Air Force veteran Ashli Babbitt. The alleged insurrection is the prevailing narrative because the protesters were largely white, Christian, and Republican, all deemed oppressor classes through the Cultural Marxist lens. Ergo, all are guilty despite proof of innocence.

The events of January 6, 2021, were a spectacle and yet an anomaly in the revolutionary struggle in the United States.

But not all of the irregular revolution is as big as January 6. Most instances are smaller, yet extremely focused.

Let's explain.

Microrevolutions

Most other battles against American citizens are more discreet, waged and won far from public view until the victim's story generates half a day's outrage on social media (when it's too late). Why would they be as high-profile as January 6? No need. This is irregular warfare. Low-intensity conflict. The gray zone. Instead of armed mobs charging into government buildings and executing anyone they find … instead of united peasants dragging all landowners in town into the streets to be humiliated and tortured … instead of religious leaders all rounded up, shot, and

dumped into mass graves they were forced to dig by hand prior … instead of repeating these obvious tactics, the modern revolutionaries engage in highly targeted "network swarms" of unhuman enemies and their allies targeting one person or one organization.[13] Physical weapons are usually not used, but this cyberwarfare has an identical purpose: to neutralize the target. Weaponized social networks and user-generated warfare achieve an acceptable similar result that real-life mobs of ages past did: enemies of the revolution are silenced, and all who sympathize with them self-censor out of terror that they're next.[14] And they do it all without summoning a modern-day White Army or Francoist Nationalists to defend and fight back. Thus, every target is completely isolated from the help they need and totally unaware of what they are really up against. The context of low-intensity conflict makes sense of this; the key to irregular warfare is to wage war *without* provoking a kinetic response, i.e., military, police, and others authorized to use force.

And so the microrevolutions can come for anyone without those targets being able to fight back or necessarily having the legal backing to muster a response. They may not have *literally* robbed or killed— but they did enough damage in order to neutralize their target. It's asymmetric warfare. Compacted, dense, tight period of fighting— without there being any fighting back.

In this way, the decades-long communist revolution taking place in the United States does not *feel* like a Bolshevik uprising, Chinese farmer revolt, or violent Spanish labor strike. Not unless you or someone you love becomes the target. Consider once again Scott Adams. Following his controversial comments in early 2023, the network of media institutions and social influencers who adhere to the oppressor versus oppressed frame were *incited* to act. Adams's successful career as a syndicated cartoonist and traditionally published bestselling author were *seized*, as was his reputation in popular culture and good name online. All positive mention of Adams and his life's work was then *purged* by search engines, most social media companies, and all internet encyclopedias that document the lives of public figures and notable people.

This was a microrevolution. Microuprising. Microrevolt. And the reason the unhumans do it is it works. And it works without provoking an organized response, reprisal, or revenge from any competing institutions or organizations. It's a war fought in one direction. Conservatives, moderates, and farmers market liberals who are not independently wealthy cannot survive the gray zone gauntlet. Not just on the internet where everything is forever, or in their career where stable corporate employment may no longer be an option, or in their personal life where divorce and loss of their children may be guaranteed. But many made to suffer by the unhumans commit suicide, just as prisoners in the Soviet gulag did decades prior.[15] Murder is one thing. Terrorizing you until you long for death is another. This is what they do.

A microrevolution is an important concept, and a weapon of the Cultural Marxist in the irregular revolution. The most common form of microrevolution is cancel culture directed against a single individual over a compressed period of time, which can be defined as a rapid and intense social movement aimed at holding a specific person "accountable" for their perceived transgressions, rooted in Cultural Marxist principles. This phenomenon involves a concentrated effort by a collective group to challenge the individual's perceived power or privilege, often utilizing social media and online platforms as organizing tools. At its core, this form of microrevolution reflects Marxist ideas of class struggle and the redistribution of power. It manifests as a grassroots movement where the proletariat—the general public or marginalized communities—mobilize to confront and challenge the actions or statements of an individual perceived to represent the bourgeoisie or wield significant influence and privilege.

The process typically begins with the exposure of controversial behavior or statements by the

targeted individual, often through social media platforms. As information (usually incorrect information) spreads rapidly, fueled by outrage and shared experiences, it catalyzes a swift and intense response from the community. This response may include calls for boycotts, demands for public apologies or resignations, and the withdrawal of support for the individual in question.

Within the Marxist framework, this microrevolution reflects a challenge to ideological hegemony—the dominant cultural beliefs and values perpetuated by those in power, so they say. Moreover, the compressed timeline of a microrevolution mirrors the urgency and immediacy often associated with Marxist revolutions. Rather than gradual change or reform, the focus is on rapid and decisive action to address perceived injustices and inequalities. The mob will not be satiated until it has consumed its victims. And thus, the instigators of the microrevolution are able to neutralize or purge their targets.

In irregular warfare, combatants engage in whatever they can get away with, even out of typical sequence so long as they get a win. Sometimes these pre-revolutionary and revolutionary events occur in the usual order. In others, out of order. Or the actual revolution happens concurrently or even prior to the OPE activities, with purging of the past followed by new messaging to "pre-suade" disaffected groups, followed by their unleashing to loot without legal consequences. Only those who resist the anarcho-tyranny are punished. This is now the case in major US cities with defunded police and activist district attorneys.

The Scott Adams story is not an isolated incident. His episode is one among many of easy-to-find examples of the low-intensity, highly targeted uprising against normal people the unhumans force on individuals every single day. Consider any canceled or beguiled public figure, any normal one with normal views that even the elite held during the Barack Obama administration. What happened to them? All of them? The mob was incited, the person's livelihood was seized, and their credibility and opportunities purged. Every. Single. Time.

And so the gray zone revolution marches onward, targeting any of us who dare to refuse a loyalty pledge to the oppression model of reality. This is at great personal risk because the environment has been made unhuman; the presumed-innocent and assumed-guilty have been identified. Accusations and manipulations have already been decided. And all institutions and organizations meant to protect law, order, and human rights have been infiltrated. Dreamers stop dreaming as big. Innovators stop innovating. Investors stop investing. And those who do, keep as low a profile as they can. Big risks that could take civilization forward into a new area of progress and beauty aren't worth it since they draw the wrong kind of attention from the wrong people. If you are too successful, and you do not pledge support for the revolution in any way it's demanded of you, then you're next. This is a problem. And as a result of it, history has paused on us. Civilization is halted. Stagnating. Festering. Existing without really living. Like cancer. Unhuman.

Together with the broken mental model we introduced you to in Chapter 2, this reframe of America's present crisis as a gray-zone communist revolution makes it all make sense. It maps well, so well that you are now able to predict with confidence which types of people will be targeted by the unhumans, what will be said of them, how they will be exiled to modern-day Siberia—debanked, deplatformed, and otherwise destroyed—and why. A worldview that predicts with accuracy is as good as true.

Now, this new paradigm may not map 100 percent perfectly onto the sociopolitical or economic situation of every person living in a Western country. We get it. There are other issues to contend with. Yes. We understand that. And yet we argue that the Irregular Revolution, a.k.a. "Communist Revolution 2.0" is so likely to be 100 percent real *and* responsible for the big stuff

that our proposition is too high-risk to dismiss. We're talking about *unhumans* here. They are real now as they have been for more than a quarter of the last millennium. Wherever and whenever they emerge, they abolish rights to life, liberty, and property. This is what they do. These days, they're just sneakier about how they do it. Are you cool with that?

We'd ask any normies who disagree with our hypothesis that we are enduring a gray-zone communist revolution the following question: **What if there is a 10 percent chance we are correct?**

A 10 percent chance. That you, reading this right now, are at moderate to high risk of being targeted for "e-ssassination" by unhumans online or with means far worse in the real world. Anarcho-tyranny already has years of precedent. A 10 percent chance. What if?

We'll up the ante with another question. Set aside likelihood; consider utility. Does the Irregular Revolution frame *predict* with meaningful accuracy? Let's say you had adopted this frame within the last five years. Would you have been able to predict the news with accuracy? You would have predicted that, for example, criminals would be set free and police officers and citizens acting in self-defense would be charged. Has that happened? You'd have predicted that private property of various haves would be seized by have-nots, with that theft made legal. Has that happened? You'd also have predicted politically motivated lawfare and other persecution of the enemies of Cultural Marxism. Has that happened? What about rage mobs incited overnight to destroy the reputations and livelihoods of nonpublic figures over the alleged offense of saying or doing the wrong thing, with that thing being any word or deed deemed that of oppressor harming oppressed?

Yes. All that and more has come to pass. Run that projection into the future. The frame predicts.

Suppose you're with us. You agree. You assess the risk. You realize the stakes. You know how fragile civilization is and how ruthless are the forces against it. You understand what's really going on. What then should we do? Well, we'll tell you what *not* to do first and foremost. Actually, we'll let Generalissimo Franco tell you:

> We do not believe in government through the voting booth. The Spanish national will was never freely expressed through the ballot box. Spain has no foolish dreams.[16]

To any good little conservatives reading, please don't get your polyester made-in-USA panties in knots. Do what radicals don't and consider the context of the quote. Franco, speaking in 1938 in the midst of brutal war against the unhumans of his day, understood that force must be met with force. Consider that the anarcho-tyrants of Spain had been *elected* by the people. Then they reigned over them with terror.

Our study of history has brought us to this conclusion: Democracy has never worked to protect innocents from the unhumans. It is time to stop playing by rules they won't.

Unhumans cannot be shamed into reform either; charging them with hypocrisy for praising a murderer and denigrating the victim as happened in the tragedy of Laken Riley is to wave the white flag of surrender. They *know* they are holding normal, beautiful people to a different standard than the miserable wretched monsters. This is what they do. Ms. Riley was white and therefore should have known better than to jog alone. The murderer was an illegal immigrant, gang-affiliated, and non-white; given this intersectionality, of course he couldn't have known any better, for he was merely a victim of the white heteronormative system of Western patriarchal oppression he internalized upon economic migration into the United States. So this is

a story with not one but two victims. The illegal immigrant didn't kill Laken Riley; *white people* did.

This viewpoint is so repulsive it's impossible to take seriously until you realize that this is literally what they believe—the bureaucrats and their activist allies who hold your legal, financial, and social fate in their hands.[17] (Yes, an actual *New York Times* piece blames "White domination" for the "enduring and endemic violence" of non-whites. No, that's not a misreading or misinterpretation.[18]) Hatred of the haves and adoration for the have-nots is not a bug in this system but its key feature. Normal people cannot believe it's possible for unhumans to exist until they encounter them—until the microrevolution comes for them personally. Then it's *somebody should DO something* but by then it's too late. Terror has chosen you.

What also shocks normies is the brutality, the cruelty, the, uh, unfairness. Don't these underprivileged groups simply want equality? Social justice? A hand up and a leg up? That all sounds good, to the cosmopolitan moderate. We live in a global community, after all, so can't we all just get along? Imagine no countries, no religion, no possessions. Can't the world just live as one?

Childish thinking betrays the fundamental misunderstanding of our situation that we brought up in Chapter 2—and of the season Western civilization is in. Consider that communist uprisings of the twentieth century and prior were conflicts of a legitimately aggrieved class against actual oppressors. Unhumans were able to amass eager followings for this very reason. But the United States has built the greatest system in world history for individual merit, social mobility, and universal education. Industrialization of Western Europe and then the US lifted the world out of feudalism and its rigid haves versus have-nots hierarchy. Then free markets (capitalism) could get to work lifting the rest of the developing world from poverty. This kicked in during the last half of the twentieth century. Without feudalism and social stagnation to fight, and with capitalism showing its superiority to lift people from poverty, the unhumans had to switch gears, literally, from manual laborers in factories and on farms as their chosen people to agitate, to other groups. This marked the great shift of Marxism from economics to sociology. Any group, class, caste, or other social identity that could (1) claim victimhood status and (2) identify a guilty party became a fertile environment for unhuman activity. They didn't really have a choice. Communism had to swap out socioeconomic class struggle for other group differences because capitalism empowered so many have-nots to become haves. In the US, we don't have a history of feudalism; we have a history of freedom that has been extended to more and more groups over time, meaning there are far fewer legitimate grievances here in the present than there are and have been abroad. This also means that communists can manufacture grievances to their dark little hearts' content—just to make people mad and gain power over them. How do you deal with that?

For one, accept that this is our situation. Elon Musk put it this way:

> Most reasonable people, because they are reasonable, cannot believe that the goal of the far left is to end America.[19]

You've come with us this far and so you now believe, or at the very least find the premise believable. Now comes the action. What to do about it.

Again, we cannot vote or shame our way out of a problem that neither of those got us into. So what *does* work? What crushes the communist? History leaves us with many questions but the

occasional answer. This is one of them.

The Iron Law of Exact Reciprocity

Do you know what the longest, most-organized, and best-preserved legal text from the ancient world is? You might assume the laws of Moses in the Old Testament, perhaps the Ten Commandments specifically. Then you'd be wrong. Another set of laws predates the events of Exodus by three hundred years minimum: the Code of Hammurabi. The US Capitol displays a relief portrait of this Babylonian king for good reason, as his laws were the rule of his lands. From Hammurabi's Code we get the very idea of "rule of law." His were the first laws that human civilization recognized as essential to the establishment and existence of said civilization. From Hammurabi we also learn the most powerful persuasion technique that protects a society from those who would destroy it from within: reciprocity. Consider these excerpts from the Code:

- Falsely accuse someone of murder, and you will be executed.
- Receive a precious metal deposit to invest, and you must return it or its equivalent—even if you lose that original deposit.
- Blind someone else, and you will be blinded.
- Build a house not up to construction safety standards, and you will be made to correct the mistake at no cost to the customer.[20]

The Iron Law of Exact Reciprocity has been denigrated by well-meaning individuals over the centuries, with certain activists claiming that an eye for an eye makes the whole world blind. We laugh. This is obviously not the case. Eye-for-an-eye laws protect innocent eyes from assault by aspiring eye-gougers, who are now made to fear the consequence of that reciprocal eye removal law and rightly so. That's reciprocity. Without reciprocity, we are without civilization. We become anti-civilization. We become: unhuman. This was true then, later, and now.

Do you know why the Cold War never turned kinetic? There were hot messes of misadventure to be sure, such as the ill-fated anti-guerrilla campaigns into communist Vietnam. Historians, filmmakers, and commentators have made careers out of their own pet answer to that question. Despite the proxy wars, the people of Earth never saw a nuclear war. We did not go extinct when we could have and perhaps nearly did. Why? The answer is as simple as it is primal. The State Department called it Atomic Diplomacy.[21] We call it the state of humanity. Watch it play out in this totally real conversation that definitely took place in 30,000 BC.

> **Og:** I have a big stick. Why shouldn't I beat you to death with it and take your wife and cave?
> **Grog:** Because I have a big stick, too. If you try to hit me with yours, I will beat you to death with mine first.

And so Og and Grog spoke softly and carried their big sticks. They lived out their days in peace. Descendants like Hammurabi would codify their finding into law. And that's how all of us got here, with our inalienable rights to life, liberty, and property. Civilization cannot exist in the absence of reciprocity. Violence is nature's way. We use it against her to shape, twist, crush, move, and otherwise manipulate her to our own devices, which, as humans, are to survive and to

reproduce. The same goes in dealings with each other. Atomic Diplomacy is better known by its less-friendly descriptor: *mutually assured destruction.* The United States did not strike the Soviet Union with nuclear weapons because the Soviet Union would do the same in return, and vice versa.

To the principle of reciprocity, we're now going to add the process for defeating communism. It is what the great men of history have done—and what their ideological allies across time *could* have done given the right resources—but reframed for our time.

CHAPTER 13

THE PLAN: COUNTERREVOLUTIONARY STRATEGY AND TACTICS

> *I am firmly convinced that if, from the beginning of the revolutionary movement, Headquarters and the generals at the front had forgotten their personal interests and acted unanimously and resolutely, the Army would not have collapsed nor the interior fallen prey to anarchy, or at least things would have been checked in time.*
>
> —Pyotr Wrangel, *Always with Honor*

When the unhumans bring a show of force, team humanity must bring forth an even greater one. This is the only way.

So to fully map the process of crushing the Irregular Revolution, let's briefly revisit the three defeats of communism from Chapter 4. Then we'll see how successful communist crushers followed one or more of those paths to victory, with overwhelming might that brought the unhumans to well-earned ruin. And finally, we'll seal the lesson with a call to action—how to fight and win the gray zone communist revolutionary war currently being waged in the United States. Let's begin.

Three Ways to Crush the Revolution, Revisited

Communist revolutions have changed as warfare has changed. Welcome to the irregular revolution. Here's how to defeat it.

1. The Ouroboros Option (The Snake Eats Itself)

Wherever unhumans emerge to feast on the flesh and blood of innocents, their unsatiated hunger and unquenched thirst subsequently drive them to eat each other. Those doing the doxxing and canceling will be doxxed and canceled by those more radical on their own team. Debankers, deplatformers, and otherwise destroyers of their enemies' lifestyles and lives will then turn on their own. Already we have witnessed the radical left begin to eat its own, the great purge of

#metoo being one notable example. Leftist-on-leftist gray-zone economic conflict, cyberwarfare, and lawfare, that mess was.

That said, this the first way to destroy anti-civilization is passive. It requires much time and great patience, which many of us may not have. Waiting it out is not ideal for those of us targeted for terror, for looting and killing in any way the unhumans can get away with (or get away from before getting caught and charged). We do not recommend re-creating the 1990s Russian depression, either for the United States as a whole—suffering an unprecedented and protracted national decline—or for us as canceled and humiliated individuals without independent stores of wealth and resources that can outlast 1990s Russia on American soil—which would be a world without supply chains, police, and in many cases electricity. We have not yet reached "peak woke" and in our view are nowhere near it. Previous communist seizures and purges have been thorough. The gray-zone revolutionary communists we face today are haphazard and prefer targets of convenience. This means they have covered much less ground, i.e., robbed and killed far fewer in meatspace, cyberspace, and all other spaces where irregular warfare is waged. The unhumans have their work cut out for them. They know this. They, like communist China with its one-hundred-year plan, are willing to wait out their prey. The predators will turn on each other, but we expect that final intraparty battle to take years if not decades.

What to do until they eat each other? Recall George Kennan's containment strategy that prevented direct conflict with the Soviet Union and protected American allies and protectorates from Soviet influence and expansion. It worked. Scale the Kennan plan down from the national to the regional, local, and individual levels, and we might have a play here.

Containment requires keeping the unhumans where they are. Let them destroy themselves, yes, *and* far away from the rest of us. There shall be no footholds allowed in our territory, geographic, economic, or otherwise. We are free and will remain so. In the United States, that means state governors, county sheriffs, and district attorneys, you have the watch. It is up to you to contain evil where it is and stamp it out immediately and resolutely when and where it appears in your proximity. Reciprocity, remember? As for we the people, it is our job to support you financially and socially—particularly financially, for those of us with means.

Those of us who are unfortunately surrounded already, physically or socially or economically, we must get away. Like Wrangel's White Army, retreat with honor. Assert your sovereign individualism—rebuild elsewhere, where it's safe. This may mean a geographic move or an economic one for protection. Get your personal finances in order so you can *afford* to laugh at the cancel mobs when they come for your livelihood, make your income and investments independent of loyalty pledges demanded of you, and ensure the security of you and your loved ones.

The perfect situation is that communism is crushed before it must ever be contained. We will discuss how to defeat the uprising before it appears. But that may not be available for you, in the real world. You may already be a subject of unhumans. You are employed by unhumans. You are married to … you get it. You know. There's nowhere for you to run or to hide. You are at the mercy of those who show no mercy. We will not fault you for doing what you must to survive, including taking the pledge through your lying teeth, hoping and praying that *someone should just DO something*. That's what the next two ways to fight communism are. But be careful that while you suffer among the unhumans you don't become one. Collaborators cannot regain a clean conscience.

This is why we do *not* advocate for waiting out the revolutionary war, with that one

exception being the containment strategy. Now, the reason we're a bit sour on letting the unhumans descend on one another to bring about their own defeat is it leaves the most vulnerable to their attack, well, vulnerable. Recall that the underclass communists prey on and persuade to do their bidding are oppressed *worse* after the revolution succeeds than after. They are led to their own slaughter and lied to the entire way. We have compassion for those who turn to anti-civilization. Many live unenviable lives and have nothing to live for—but the unhumans will give them something to kill and die for. This is not good. And so for the sake of *all* who will be targeted for microrevolutions now and later, we believe it prudent that we do not wait out Communist Revolution 2.0. Only the independently wealthy and location-independent have the freedom to do so, their fortunes protected by various offshoring strategies and with their livelihood decoupled from their reputation. In fact, they may have no reputation, remaining altogether anonymous and safe from unhuman harm. The risk for the revolution to come their way is already higher than for most given their likely designation as oppressors. Why should they who can save themselves stick their necks out? Consider the fate of Louis XIV; he thought himself and his family and fortune safe from the red terror engulfing his people. He could have chosen differently. So can some of you reading this book.

2. Great Men of Means

The great men and women of means, and history, usually did not view themselves as such. Those driven by ego and validation rarely make decisions that sacrifice both. Yet this is what the great ones must do. When the forces of anti-civilization have burned across a land, there have been a select few who saw what had to be done and had the will to do it—one strong man and his mates. Julius Caesar, Napoleon Bonaparte, Pyotr Wrangel, Francisco Franco, Chiang Kai-shek—each with their officers, their soldiers, their fighting men in arms. And those defensive firearms are needed given what has already transpired. When unhumans seize territory, first they ban guns. The unhumans then do what they will, and the unarmed innocent suffer what they must. Then along comes someone who doesn't come along often. The one who utters in word or deed, as Franco did:

> Wherever I am, there will be no communism.

And they mean it.

Historians choose who we remember. It is the great men of history who choose to be made memorable. Whenever such a man has willed communism into submission, it has always been with equitable means. The communist-socialists shoot the priests; Franco's forces shoot them dead. Caesar's enemies plotted to arrest him and establish their own new world order; Caesar arrested them first. Soviet sympathizers tried to poison the youth with media and schooling; Senator McCarthy poisoned their reputation to make them unemployable. Reciprocity.

This the second way to defeat the unhumans demands the *means* of reciprocation, which many of you reading this do not possess. It's OK; you still get to support the one who does. You'll know them when you see them, as they attract all the literal and metaphorical firepower of the enemy. Consider Elon Musk, the sole protector of anything like freedom of speech on the internet, who has been subjected to cruel and unusual lawfare by unhuman bureaucrats and activists. He must have our full support. Franco needed his generals; Bonaparte, his officers; Musk, his netizens.

That said, if you are one who could stay on the sidelines, sitting this one out to the end with your own family safe and your fortune intact, this might feel to you like a call to action. It is. You have the alignment, visibility, and at least some resources necessary to have a fighting chance at fighting back. You know this. You have the power. Do you have the will to use it?

Otherwise, your fate may be that of Louis XVI, in your own way and in your own time. You may go solemnly to the end and everything you love with you, deceived by a false sense of safe escape. It didn't have to go that way. You had an opening. Opportunity. Power. But not will.

Have the will to power. And if you do, here's how you can use it.

Great Deeds for Great Men and the Iron Law of Exact Reciprocity

We'll get right to it. The great American counterrevolution to depose the Cultural Marxists must occur on all terrains of society they currently possess and on those they aim to seize. This is tantamount to total victory. It is achievable but only with the resolve of Franco and the thoroughness of McCarthy.

Cultural Marxists run operations in media, government, education, economy, family, religion, and arts and entertainment. This is what they do; this is what they've done, having completed a long march through the institutions. As a result, and as only a few examples, targeted lawfare to take down private citizens and political enemies is succeeding, as they hold key prosecutorial and judicial positions. Schools are littered with anti-American propaganda to train up a new Red Guard; meanwhile, children deemed members of the oppressor race and religion are punished and persecuted by both administration and classmates and those of the alleged oppressed race are given passing grades for failing class and actual passes for violent behavior. Cultural Marxists have also infiltrated mainline Protestant Christian denominations to recast Jesus Christ from spiritual messiah to socioeconomic radical who wants to raise your taxes. (If while reading that you thought, *What lawfare? What propaganda? What churches?* then we really can't help you. Greatness demands minimum viable awareness of what's going on. Some reading this lack it. There may still be a place for you supporting those leading the counterrevolution.)

What else can be done to turn the tide? Let's let reciprocity answer the question, specifically, the **Iron Law of Exact Reciprocity**. Eyefor-an-eye protects innocent eyes from future assault. So this is what the great men of our time can do:

A humiliation tactic—naming and shaming—most famously used in Mao's China can be repurposed to beat the Cultural Marxists at their own game. Terror is a double-edged weapon.

What we need are lists. Turning Point USA publishes a "Professor Watchlist" with dossiers on college and university staff known to "discriminate against conservative students, promote anti-American values and advance leftist propaganda in the classroom."[1] They hate this. Good. This is a start, so let's keep going, and with better-funded publicity. We should all know their names for their shame. McCarthy made beloved Americans total industry outcasts in an instant with exposés of their secret subversive activities. We need men and women of action to do the same—and to fund it. Yes in education but also in media, throughout the economy, and more. This could take the form of well-documented (and well-promoted) lists with dossiers, or it could be more highly targeted. When Elon Musk purchased Twitter, he labeled National Public Radio as "US state-affiliated media" and later "Government Funded Media." NPR, known for consistently misrepresenting news through that oppressor-oppressed lens, thrashed at the charge. Upward of 11 percent of NPR's budget comes from direct and indirect government funding.[2] NPR rage-quit Twitter as a result and has not returned. Musk's micro-counterrevolutionary effort succeeded.

And yet this amounts to perhaps 0.01 percent of the effort required to identify and oust Cultural Marxists from positions and institutions in their clutches. Reciprocity will continue to guide us. Whichever organizations and influencers across the social terrain are engaging in microrevolution against normal people, put them on the list. Then, publish that list. Then promote it. Advertise the counterrevolution. Let Cultural Marxists tremble in fear that they will be named and shamed, just as they have named and shamed so many into ruin. Reciprocity works. It's mutually assured cancellation. The unhumans will not stop until they are stopped.

The needle has moved a little in this effort. Consider the work of Christopher Rufo and James O'Keefe. Rufo is known for unveiling the serial plagiarism that brought down former Harvard University president Claudine Gay, a notable DEI hire (in this context, DEI meaning "Didn't Earn It"). Rufo is despised by the unhumans because he uses their own weapon against them to great effect. Another similar counterrevolutionary strategist is Chaya Raichik, creator of Libs of TikTok, whose standard operation is simply reposting radicals' own subversive social media content for a broader audience to see (and be horrified by).

Now, as for O'Keefe, he has for years exposed minions of the forces of unhumanity in government, media, and economic mainstays such as healthcare. His infiltrative work reveals all manner of office politics, infighting, and gossip, yes, but also leaves naked the extent to which giant organizations have been intentionally hollowed out by unhuman efforts. Unfortunately, we haven't witnessed much change afterward. The minion staffer deletes their social media after O'Keefe goes public, leftist media publishes hit pieces about O'Keefe, O'Keefe gains support for more work, and on the cycle goes. What we need are 1,001 more special operators like O'Keefe, Raichik, and Rufo— and men of great means backing them. Also necessary is something like a step-by-step process for maximizing the counterrevolutionary effectiveness of their infiltrative and revelatory work. In O'Keefe's case, the unhumans in control are the ones the public needs to see on hidden cameras. That footage must then be entered into the record as evidence, with reciprocal lawfare waged against these individuals until they are ousted in shame and their organizations brought to heel. We have yet to see statesmen demonstrate a will to do so. That must change.

Reciprocal lawfare must be a response to the lawfare experienced now in the United States and the Collective West. There will be no stopping of it until this occurs. Consider the power of a legal subpoena. These cost organizations thousands of dollars in legal bills just to respond to, not to mention the vast amounts of time required. Attorney generals in red districts could easily be going after Antifa, BLM or the array of Soros-affiliated NGOs. RICO lawsuits could easily be brought as well. One obvious example would be in the realm of NGOs that profit from illegal immigration, via taxpayer dollars. Why hasn't the AG of Texas cracked down on them? Alabama? Mississippi? The list goes on. If no reciprocity is felt, they will keep reaching further and further with their lawfare, including the leftist judges on the bench. The only answer to this is exact reciprocity. We'll see if Republicans have the stomach for it.

Organized boycotts are another tool for cultural counterrevolution. They work, as witnessed in 2023 with the influencer-led boycott of Bud Light products. The beermaker lost a projected $1 billion in sales.[3] Alas, revenue has begun to recover, as many conservative Americans targeted by company marketing have returned to purchasing it. Blame our country's cultural alcoholism, yes, but also recognize that power requires will to maintain. The longer boycotts last, the better they work.

"But that's, like, totally not nice," some principled conservatives have said of boycotts. Understand the time and the season. Gray zone revolution is not occurring in a vacuum or in a

state with no prior history. A civilization built on law and order demands the maintenance of that law and order or soon there is no civilization left. There is a reason convicted criminals are punished (or used to be). Restitution is reciprocity. It's Hammurabi. We forget this to our own shame and to those who will be targeted by the unhumans we could have stopped. Nothing here in this section or in this book advocates illegal violence. Nothing. We do advocate for *legal* weapons of mass persuasion. The enemies of truth and justice are already using them, and our recourse is to use them back. If that's shame, use shame. If that's money, use money.

Speaking of money, why does NPR receive 11 percent of their budget from federal, state, and local governments? Why? Could it be that taxpayers do not realize they are funding Cultural Marxism directly? And could it be that if they were informed by mass awareness campaigns that they would choose for their hard-earned money to be spent elsewhere? Could it?

Which brings us to our biggest ask of all. Those of you reading this book with influence in the federal government, this is for you:

The time is right and technology available to propose and pass a National Tax Transparency Act. This new law, duly enacted following valid and corrective legislative and executive procedure, will allow for the permanent visibility of the citizenry as to the spending of their federal taxes down to the last dollar. It is no secret unhumans have parasitized the national governments of many Western countries, funneling the public treasury back into their minions' pockets through various media, education, economic, religious, and art and entertainment initiatives and groups whose explicit objective is to demolish Western civilization. Our ask is not even that this be made to stop; it's that the man or woman who understands what our moment calls for put forward the action plan to allow all America to know this is occurring.

This mirrors the list tactic. To be forced into the open is to let your covert manipulation lose its advantage. So let the people see. Let the people trace every tax return, every estimated payment, every withheld-from-the-paycheck dollar to its final destination. Then let the public decide how they feel about it—and how they feel about those allocating the budget. Care can be taken to protect classified materials and projects, of course. But that same culture of bureaucratic secrecy that built a taxpayer panopticon is the very problem—the federal government demands total transparency into how we earn our money so they can tax it, while we have absolute-zero visibility into how that taxed money is spent.

On the topic of visibility, the National Tax Transparency Act could be paired with other legislation mandating transparency into voting systems at the federal, state, and local levels. Advances in technology now allow for security and privacy so every voter could look up every vote they cast after the fact to confirm no one else voted in their name, their vote was not counted more than once, and indeed their vote was in fact counted. Cryptography, blockchain, and other decentralized tools such as Zero-Knowledge Proofs are able to put this idea into action, all of it with existing tech. Of course, the days of representative democracy are themselves numbered, as *The Sovereign Individual* predicted; in the digital age it no longer makes sense for citizens to have decisions made on their behalf and especially not by those manipulated by lobbying, blackmail, and other interests opposed to the citizens' welfare. We see a day coming when every citizen is a democracy unto themselves as well as a budget allocator; what laws they desire to abide by, they will pass for themselves. What projects they wish to fund, they will self-allocate money toward. This is the future of government, perhaps the far future, but the future nonetheless. And transparency into both taxation and voting results are the great transitional form between the present and this glorious future where sovereign individuals may live free.

We have a way to go. Returning to the present, we realize that advanced privacy tools could

maintain one-way privacy so only you know how you voted and not some unelected DEI bureaucrat-activist. We believe that voting transparency and "trust but verify" records are a transitional form to the ultimate state of democracy, which is that each citizen is a lawgiver unto him or herself. In a digital world where information is nearly free to transmit and consume, it does not make logical (or technological) sense for someone else to make laws on your behalf while you have no say, hide those laws in omnibus bills, or levy and spend your tax money in any way you deem unfit. In a post-revolutionary future when Team Humans have won, we foresee that when you disagree with a given law then, as a law-abiding citizen, you will not have to comply with it. And if you do not want your tax dollars funding an activity you disagree with, you will be able to opt out and either save that money or devote it into a more productive activity.

The best way to defeat the irregular revolution we're facing is to stop funding it. The second-best way is to deplete it of revolutionaries. Just as the great men of history target the subversives to neutralize their behavior, we must not forget their potential followers who would do their bidding, led on by a promise of fortune and glory if only they cast aside all sense of humanity and commit unspeakable atrocity. In former times, our elite were endowed with noblesse oblige, which was the recognition that with high status came high responsibility, specifically for the disadvantaged and downtrodden, those various groups who left to their lot in life make ideal targets for perversion into the forces of unhumanity. This is what was forgotten in the various empires that fell to the communist revolution. We forgot at our own peril.

Modern noblesse oblige in the US requires great men and women of equal will and power in waging effective gray-zone war, now in a different way. What gives the underclass hope is a way up from it—a path to success. It is not possible to have hope when anarcho-tyrants reign, forcing the poorest to suffer the most at the hands of lawlessness, as they are least able to afford to leave or find alternative employment if their barely stable situation is upended, as happened to millions in the 1960s and in 2020. Numerous ills plague the underclass, from single parenthood to drug abuses to perpetual poverty. Hollowing out of Rust Belt careers from the 1970s through the 1990s due to lower-paid labor arbitrage in China brought ruin upon millions of former proud working-class Americans. We expect the Artificial Intelligence Revolution to eliminate the careers of those who somehow escaped globalization.

Historically, left-wing activists have claimed to care for the least of these most. And we do need the compassionate liberal—but we need to give them a better system than merely the goal of "helping" with zero-accountability government dollars that do more harm than any good as discussed in Chapter 9. Consider the life and work of John H. Patterson, the turn-of-the-century entrepreneur and philanthropist who made worker welfare as high a priority as profit. He introduced cleaner conditions, safer machinery, higher wages, and better hours to the workforce of National Cash Register, together with no-cost meal and entertainment opportunities. At first these measures were criticized by fellow capitalists as extreme and unnecessary, but the Daytonian's outsized success persuaded the American industrial elite to treat their employees like human beings. Patterson's compassionate capitalist is likely why the United States did not suffer a "hot" communist revolution in the same period as Russia, Spain, China, and others; the American underclass had a ladder handed down to them so they could climb their way up into stable working-class and even middle-class prosperity. Unfortunately, from the 1970s onward, our elite have kicked the ladder down. They imperil themselves.

What then is to be done by our modern-day John Pattersons who have the means to rescue the have-nots of America from socioeconomic destitution and other paths to resentment?

Consider:

Privately funded, local, and small, intimate programs that teach a systems approach to creating success in your personal life, from parenting peacefully to personal budgeting, have the potential to raise multiple generations out of poverty and into stability, for generations to come. There is only the question of who will fund and run them; would-be megadonors, we ask that you prioritize the salvation of your civilization above and beyond your portfolio's performance next quarter. Volunteers are needed, both to protect people from joining the revolution and to save them from its destruction. The revolution eats its own. We wish to save our countrymen and women from this fate.

Furthermore, to raise the downtrodden up from cyclical poverty and into prosperity, we recommend the immediate banning of all public education unions in the United States, as these institutions hold a near-monopoly on the rearing of America's publicly schooled children and are thus uniquely responsible for the disparity in outcomes between and among underclass, working, middle, and upper-class students. They've got to go. They already know better, as the most vocal proponents of teachers' unions in America send their children to private school. So let free-market competition drive citizens to the best education solutions for their children, be that public, private, home, or otherwise. A full-scale lawfare assault against the teachers' unions until every last one is shut down is a necessary path forward. We ask for no violence—only reciprocity. Add to that the forfeiture of all universities and colleges that have received taxpayer funding. Higher education as an institution has failed to prepare the next generation of the workforce to rebuild our infrastructure and create the future and instead have burdened millions with debt that is inescapable even from bankruptcy. Sometimes complex problems demand simple solutions. The student loan debt in the US is $1.73 trillion, and the total endowment of all US colleges and universities is a market value of $927 billion.[4, 5] The latter will cover just about half of the former. For the rest, student loan debt will be made dischargeable in bankruptcy. Each loan payee will see their debt nearly halved. For recouping the rest, should they so choose, loan holders will be permitted to receive a refund for any tuition paid for which they received an education they are unsatisfied with, e.g., a degree that failed to prepare them for gainful employment. The refund amount would not exceed the total remaining balance of loans due.

To be clear, this is a population that could easily be wielded and mobilized by a BLM Chavez-type figure. Trust me, you do not want to wait around for that figure to emerge.

For future higher education affordability, we agree with this recommendation from renowned psychology professor and researcher Geoffrey Miller:

> The real way to 'make college more affordable', insofar as college degrees function mostly as proxies for general intelligence for employment purposes, is for the Supreme Court to overturn Griggs v. Duke Power Co (1971) & allow employers to use cheap, fast, reliable, valid IQ tests for hiring, instead of college degrees.[6]

Every problem the gray-zone irregular communist revolution has thrust on America has an obvious solution. We have presented a few essentials here for consideration of the great men and future great of history inspired by this book. Surely there are superior versions of these ideas and others altogether we had not considered. Regardless, great men of action will be needed.

All this will take the will to power, with that power being for the benefit of people. Within one calendar year, we foresee all student loan debt eliminated and university corruption ended,

with only those higher education opportunities that serve their students and prepare them for productive careers surviving this necessary transformation. A secondary result would be a baby boom so great that the population decline problem will resolve itself within the decade if not half-decade. The future is bright only if we make it so.

Naturally, the unhumans will not be happy with these efforts and especially not with those heading them. They will fight back. For everything they've got. Dragons don't like it when the gold they've looted is returned. So we must fight back harder, with more resolve in our hearts than resentment in theirs. We will follow the leader. But in each domain—education, government, and so on—history demands more than one leader. Otherwise, it is all for naught. Consider this a word of warning, aspiring great men of history reading this book:

The honor and courage of Wrangel, Chiang, and others defeated by unhuman forces deserved better. We can't change their past but we can redirect our future. Victory over evil never comes down to one man in the arena. This is romantic but a fantasy. Recall the words of Wrangel as they opened this chapter: "unanimous and resolute." Any strategy or tactic deployed to crush the unhumans that is not both unanimous and resolute will fail.

Any insights we've gleaned from the secret history of communist revolutions are worthless if attempts to put them into practice are done scattershotly by separate individuals and isolated organizations each pursuing their own ends with their own unique means, all without coordinated timing. So while we praise Musk, we realize he is in a precarious position, in need of an elite peer group of generals and a metaphorical infantry to come to his aid.

The great man always needs an army. The network swarm targets individuals and institutions deemed vulnerable. So only individuals and institutions *more* powerful than the swarm can defeat it, can send it back to the hell from whence it came. That might be you and yours.

You'll know.

3. Victory before Battle

Reciprocity. It is possible to bring a society to ruin without warfare, to conquer it by dividing it. So, too, are there means to crush the uprising before it gets into stance. The gray zone communist war for America has already begun, but there will be millions more battles. Every day there are skirmishes. Spats. Squads of unhumans besieging their unsuspecting targets. We know what they're going to do. They're going to incite, seize, and purge, same as they've always done, but quietly this time around, targeting good, honest people one by one. These are the patriots we see in trending news daily—another one sentenced to prison, another one bankrupted from lawfare, another one ousted from their successful career, another one dead from an alleged suicide (it wasn't). No more. We know what the unhumans are going to do. So we can do it, too—we can win before fighting.

Team humanity can also prepare the environment of battles for our purpose, which is total victory. *We* can separate. *We* can message. *We* can infiltrate. And we must. Waiting it out is not an option for all of us, and it is not the best first choice for *any* of us. Meanwhile, we do admit that except for a few shining knights whose armor takes the arrows, there do not seem to be enough great men in the public eye or private sphere to protect *all* that Western civilization has to offer future generations, at least not yet. Unhumans are soiling and burning as much of it as they can, at the institutional level and the individual. A guy who builds rockets and buys Twitter back from an unhuman regime is a lot but not nearly enough. We have throughout this book pilloried the old right wing—those politicians, pundit caste, and philanthropists whose absence on the battlefield is noticeable every day in every way, each time another vulnerable target is

taken. Conservatives, moderates, and others who *do* have the means to put up a powerful public fit are pulling a Louis XVI. As X account @wokal_distance wrote:

> Left Wing Billionaires think like great men of history whose goal is to change the world. Right Wing Billionaires think middle managers whose goal is to not go broke. That's why the left invests in things that change society, while [the] right only invests in things that make money.[7]

For what shall it profit a man if he gains the whole world but loses his own civilization?

And so until such a time as new American Caesars, Wrangels, Francos, Chiangs, or McCarthys reveal themselves, it's probably up to us. To you, your family and friends, your network. Your "people." And any VIPs you know, in whatever station of society they're in.

That said, we must admit that we've struggled writing this section, on how the third way to defeat the unhumans applies to our present day. This is because historical precedent is slim. There is of course the Tank Man, a noble symbol of losing on principle. There has not yet been Tank *Men*—a force of united normal people so vast in number, so mighty in resolve, that the enemy never stood a chance despite otherwise superior firepower and institutional backing.

There was the Caesar who crossed the Rubicon, who crushed what could have become a proto-communist uprising. But this was the great man of history, nipping rebellion in the bud. Other revolts in other times and places such as those in nineteenth-century France were put down, again by military leaders with better-than-reciprocal resources to fight the forces of unhumanity.

They say communism has never been tried. This is false. But what is true is that defeating communist has never been tried *by normal people*. By people like you and us. We can nip this thing in the bud. But it's going to require yet another paradigm shift. The first new frame we've asked you to adopt is that the United States is likely in the throes of a gray-zone communist revolutionary war. The signs are present and the evidence accessible, with odds (much) higher than 10 percent that our dark hypothesis is correct.

In gray zone warfare, there is no distinction between civilian and combatant. You know this in theory. And now, we are asking you to accept it in practice. We are asking **you** to become a combatant. Because you already are.

How Normal People Can Crush Communist Revolution 2.0

Everything we have said in this book will be twisted out of context by our unhuman enemies. This is what they do. They will of course leave out the part we'll say next. We will say it anyway because it is the right thing to do.

Unhumans rob and kill. We do not.

Illegal and harmful acts to further any political cause should be condemned totally. We do. Thus, all commentary of ours should be interpreted in the spirit of law and order. We cannot save civilization by suspending it. That is what the unhumans do; they promise a better world on the other side of a far, far worse one. They lie. They guarantee easy heaven and deliver perpetual hell.

We suggest you do what it takes to win **before** the fight. To protect yourself, your family, your city, your state, and your country from the unhuman battles to come. We are asking you to unite with others of like mind and spirit. And together, we will crush the communist revolution.

Here's how we the people are going to do it.

Counterrevolutionary OPE to Win

What they do to us, we do right back. In the case of counterrevolutionary warfare, we must all shore ourselves up so that we can defend ourselves in the event we are targeted for microrevolution, when the anonymous hordes of social media or the HR department attempt to incite, seize, and purge. We will be ready. This is war. An irregular war, yes. But a war. Now we will act like it.

And so we will follow **OPE Stage 1**, **Separate**. For normal people, that means building a network of like-minded people you can trust. Remember the terrains of society: government, media, education, economic, religious, and art and entertainment. Which of these pertain to your life? Your local government officials from the school board and sheriff deputies to district attorney, prosecutor, the chief of police. Who actively does the work of safeguarding law and order around you? These are your people. Know them by name, and they, you. The same goes for media you consume. Separate yourself from people who hate your values and support independent creators who honor and valorize them. Do all business you can this way, working with and buying from those who are values aligned and shunning your dollar from those who launder their profits into subversive activity. This ought not need to be said and yet it does. Consider also the education of your children if you have any. Is it best to allow them to be propagandized by radicals who despise Western civilization and everything our heritage has entrusted us with? If not, bring them home to homeschool or unschool, or consider an independent values-aligned religious school. Start your teenagers at a centrist community college, not a lifetime-of-debt major university where they are at risk of getting turned into actual communists. Consider alternative income sources besides an 8-to-5 job so you can hold your head high if you are asked to recant a belief everyone on the American left held ten years ago. *Buy* your free speech rights back with a side hustle or self-employment opportunity. These opportunities are not difficult to find if you have the will to look.

You must prepare your environment for counteroperation so if and when the microrevolution comes to you, your family, or your community, you will have set apart your allies and your resources. They'll have your back. You will be ready.

OPE Stage 2, Message, can occur simultaneously with the first. Or after. Or way after. Or way before. Or when the microrevolt against you is already at hand. Warfare in the gray zone is irregular, messy, chaotic, out of order sometimes. So can the preparation of your environment for it be, at times. This may be one of them.

The only message you will need to protect your loved ones from revolutionary persuasion and also neutralize those who do ever come for you is the one message that no unhuman has ever been able to withstand. It is their first and last kryptonite. It is the unhuman's bane: laughter.

So mock the unhumans. Humiliate the unhumans. Ridicule the unhumans. Disgrace, debase, and deride the unhumans. Put the unhumans to shame. Tease and taunt and parody the unhumans. Scorn, scoff, and sneer.

If this is what you'll do when the unhumans attempt a microuprising against you, why are we talking about it in Operational Preparation of the Environment for counterrevolution? Two reasons. One, this is a decision you make ahead of time, not in the moment. Cancel mobs and serial doxxers force their targets into submission through unforeseen terror. There was just no way this tax-paying, rule-following 'merican could ever deserve such treatment. Then came the unhumans to steal and kill and destroy. Lives broken and shattered. This is what they do.

And so now is the time to decide you will deploy the unhuman's bane at first chance and upon first glance from the unhumans. You will not attempt to turn the tables on their feelings with your facts. This is why conservatives, moderates, and garden-variety liberals lose. You cannot reason with that which rejects reason. Resentment is their logic; envy, their thinking. You are a decided oppressor and thus deserving of the worst treatment they can muster in this low-intensity conflict context.

So decide now. That you will be like former President Donald Trump commenting on the 2024 State of the Union address delivered by President Joe Biden. President Trump did not critique or fact-check or call out the various logical fallacies Biden deployed by name. No, he used Snapchat filters to give President Biden and Vice President Kamala Harris goofy faces. He took them as seriously as he believed they deserved to be taken.

Also at the time of this writing, in the news was social commentator and cartoonist Stonetoss, who was doxxed by self-proclaimed communists online. The artist behind the comic had all the usual accusations foisted upon him. What did he do? Did he react with fear, tremble in terror, publish an apology letter written in legalese, and shut down his accounts? This is exactly what many public figures and private individuals have done, so what did Stonetoss do?

His first post after the doxxing was to announce a special sale on his cartoon tie-in plush toy. Subsequent posts of this used creative memes, GIFs, and other media to mock his accusers, promote the sale, and prove his mettle. The sale was so popular and volume of orders so high, customers reportedly crashed his ecommerce store.[8] Haters are your most valuable marketers.

You may not have a product to sell, but you probably have a reputation to protect. So when the mob comes to seize your dignity and purge your good name, ruin theirs first—with laughter. Neutralize the terror. Turn around, point at the big, dark monster lurching toward you in the hallway, and laugh. As in dreams, so in reality.

The message our laughter sends is twofold—you're telling the mob, in effect, *Where I am, there will be no communism*, in your own way. And you're also spreading a message of hope to other potential targets, setting the example for those in your circle and those who later hear about what happened—how you withstood the mob with a smile and maybe made some money off their hate-promoting you. You disarm the mob not just for yourself but for other like-minded people in your environment. Which is the second reason why we've placed this in counterrevolutionary OPE. When you've built a network of influencers, you can call on them to aid you in your time of need. Returning fire with persuasion will not be you against the mob; it will be you and your generals and officers, your colleagues and key connections, giving the mob a twist of their own tool.

One more thing: Never apologize. Ever. You will not express remorse. You will not explain yourself. You will not "add context." This is your life; the unhumans come to destroy it. Imagine saying you're sorry to them. Couldn't be us.

This transitions us right into **OPE Stage 3**, **Infiltrate**, and we find ourselves coming full circle. Recall the terrains of society that in OPE Stage 1 we said pertain to you, as well as the relationships you will have strategically built within them—in government, in education, in media, for example. There are the people you need to know, whose support you may need and camaraderie you may share, yes. Now who needs to know *you*? Where do you fit? What local government race could you enter? What homeschool co-op could you lead? What after-school program for the neighborhood kids could you start? What side business could you build with like-minded people?

You may not consider yourself a great hero of history, but we need great people in local

positions of influence. Your local parks department, library system, and school board are all institutions that subversives infiltrate if the opportunity presents itself. Volunteering may not make a lot of money, but it makes an eternal difference. Think beyond the bottom line; civilization depends on each of us doing what we can, be that serving on a parks or library board or committee or running in a local election.

OPE Stage 3 of the counterrevolution may require actual infiltration of existing institutions. Alternatively, if institutions with influence over you are too corrupted or too incompetent to be salvaged even from within, then building your own decentralized alternative may be the best way, as with the examples of homeschool leadership in your community or entrepreneurship, building a company of consequence in an industry overrun by Cultural Marxists with few non-woke choices.

This OPE Stage serves the other two and is in turn served by them. Effective preparation means you and yours will be safe. The microrevolution should it come will look to you pitiable, not terrible. You will laugh them off, even reverse-cancel anyone who attempts to do the same to you. You can also borrow tactics from the second way to defeat communism, where you perhaps organize a counter-boycott set against you, or collect signatures to recall an unhuman-sympathizer from a critical public office as punishment for their neglect of (or protection of) any anarcho-tyranny near you.

You may not be destined to become the great men of history. But you can be a good one. For yourself, your family, and your civilization. And if we have millions of people who do that, we can undo what the unhumans have already done in America. Our efforts may take twenty to forty years. It will be worth it. Because …

We Are Going to Win

Yes, it is possible to defeat the unhumans. We can keep any and all would-be subversives terrified of acting on their impulses with full knowledge of what will happen to them if they try. If there is anything you set to your long-term memory from this book, it is this: **The unhumans will not stop unless they are stopped.** And they can be.

Please remember what you have read in this book and more importantly how you have felt while reading it. We will leave you with these words of Francisco Franco:

> I say this to you because we Spaniards are a forgetful people, because we are used to living for the moment, because we do not look back, because we do not know how to see the chain of heroes, because we do not contemplate the sum of sacrifices.[9]

The communist revolution is the darkest chapter in human history. For whatever reason, perhaps by divine providence, it has come to us to end that chapter once and for all.

We will.

We're going to win.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1 Robespierre, M. "Report upon the Principles of Political Morality Which Are to Form the Basis of the Administration of the Interior Concerns of the Republic." 1794. In Internet Modern History Sourcebook, edited by Paul Halsall. New York: Fordham University, August 1997. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/mod/1794robespierre.asp.

2 "George Santayana." Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://iep.utm.edu/santayan/.

CHAPTER 1

1 Aristotle. "Nicomachean Ethics." Translated by W. D. Ross. In The Perseus Digital Library, edited by Gregory R. Crane. Section 1314a. Tufts University. Accessed April 10, 2024. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0058:book=5:section=1314a.

2 Klipper, Gage. "Why Self-Defense Is The Only Type Of Violence The Left Won't Endorse." Daily Caller, February 7, 2024. https://dailycaller.com/2024/02/07/self-defense-violence-left-endorse-soviet-law/.

3 Solender, Andrew. "George Floyd More Google Searched than Coronavirus and Donald Trump in the Last Week." *Forbes*, June 3, 2020. https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewsolender/2020/06/03/george-floyd-more-google-searched-than-coronavirus-and-donald-trump-in-the-last-week/.

4 Romo, Vanessa. "Pills Gathered From George Floyd Scene Contained Traces Of Methamphetamine, Fentanyl." NPR, April 7, 2021. https://www.npr.org/sections/trial-over-killing-of-george-floyd/2021/04/07/985194172/pills-gathered-from-george-floyd-scene-contained-traces-of-methamphetamine-fenta.

5 Raguse, Lou. "New Court Docs Say George Floyd Had 'Fatal Level' of Fentanyl in His System." KARE 11, August 26, 2020. https://www.kare11.com/article/news/local/george-floyd/new-court-docs-say-george-floyd-had-fatal-level-of-fentanyl-in-his-system/89-ed69d09d-a9ec-481c-90fe-7acd4ead3d04.

6 https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/drug-profiles/fentanyl_en#:~:text=The%20estimated%20lethal%20dose%20of,poly%2Dsubstance%20use%20was%20involved.

7 Raguse, Lou. "New Court Docs Say George Floyd Had 'Fatal Level' of Fentanyl in His System." KARE 11, August 26, 2020. https://www.kare11.com/article/news/local/george-floyd/new-court-docs-say-george-floyd-had-fatal-level-of-fentanyl-in-his-system/89-ed69d09d-a9ec-481c-90fe-7acd4ead3d04.

8 Ibid.

9 McCoy, Kevin, and Grace Hauck. "George Floyd's Girlfriend Courteney Ross Gives Jurors First Glimpse of His Personal Life, Good Times and Bad." *USA Today*, April 1, 2021. https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2021/04/01/george-floyd-girlfriend-courteney-ross-describes-relationship-trial/4837917001/.

10 Gorman, Steve. "George Floyd was infected with COVID-19, autopsy reveals." Reuters, June 4, 2020. https://www.reuters.com/article/idUSKBN23B1JQ/.

11 Hennepin County Medical Examiner's Office. "Autopsy Report: Cardiopulmonary Arrest Complicating Law Enforcement Subdual, Restraint, and Neck Compression." June 3, 2020. https://www.hennepin.us/-/media/hennepinus/residents/public-safety/medical-examiner/floyd-autopsy-6–3-20.pdf.

12 McEvoy, Jemima. "George Floyd Died of Heart Problems, Defense's Medical Expert Says, Suggesting Car Fumes Played a Role." *Forbes*, April 14, 2021. https://www.forbes.com/sites/jemimamcevoy/2021/04/14/george-floyd-died-of-heart-problems-defenses-medical-expert-says-suggesting-car-fumes-played-a-role/?sh=59fab0bb71c1.

13 Raguse, Lou. "New Court Docs Say George Floyd Had 'Fatal Level' of Fentanyl in His System." KARE 11, August 26, 2020. https://www.kare11.com/article/news/local/george-floyd/new-court-docs-say-george-floyd-had-fatal-level-of-fentanyl-in-his-system/89-ed69d09d-a9ec-481c-90fe-7acd4ead3d04.

14 "REVEALED: Chauvin Juror Who Promised Judge Impartiality Now Says People Should Join Juries 'to Spark Some Change,' Wore BLM Shirt in 2020." *Post Millennial*, May 2, 2021. https://thepostmillennial.com/chauvin-trial-juror-spark-some-change.

15 "George Floyd Death Anniversary." *New York Times*, May 25, 2021. https://www.nytimes.com/live/2021/05/25/us/george-floyd-death-anniversary."
16 "Demonstrations & Political Violence in America: New Data for Summer 2020." ACLED, September 3, 2020. https://acleddata.com/2020/09/03/demonstrations-political-violence-in-america-new-data-for-summer-2020/.
17 Buchanan, Larry, Quoctrung Bui, and Jugal K. Patel. "How Black Lives Matter Reached Every Corner of America." *New York Times*, July 3, 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/07/03/us/george-floyd-protests-crowd-size.html.
18 Mazza, Ed. "Politicians Tell Trump to Go Back to the Bunker After His Threat to 'Take Back' Seattle." HuffPost, June 11, 2020. https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/politics/politicians-tell-trump-to-go-back-to-the-bunker-after-his-threat-to-take-back-seattle/ar-BB15kw8q.
19 Smith, Rich, and Jas Keimig. "Sawant Marches Through City Hall with Demonstrators Demanding Mayor Durkan's Resignation." *The Stranger*, June 10, 2020. https://www.thestranger.com/slog/2020/06/09/43880885/sawant-marches-through-city-hall-with-demonstrators-demanding-mayor-durkans-resignation.
20 Chiaramonte, Perry. "Occupy Protests Plagued by Reports of Sex Attacks, Violent Crime." Fox News, November 9, 2011. https://www.foxnews.com/us/occupy-protests-plagued-by-reports-of-sex-attacks-violent-crime.
21 Garger, Kenneth. "Ex-ESPN Reporter Called Out for Altering Views of George Floyd Protesters." *New York Post*, May 31, 2020. https://nypost.com/2020/05/31/ex-espn-reporter-called-out-for-views-of-george-floyd-protesters/.
22 Allen, Karma. "Gun-Wielding St. Louis Couple Charged with Felony over Unlawful Weapons." ABC News, July 20, 2020. https://abcnews.go.com/US/gun-toting-st-louis-couple-charged-threatening-protesters/story?id=71885604.
23 Kaufmann, Eric. "The Social Construction of Racism in the United States." Manhattan Institute, April 7, 2021. https://manhattan.institute/article/the-social-construction-of-racism-in-the-united-states.
24 McCaffree, Kevin, and Anondah Saide. "How Informed Are Americans about Race and Policing?" Skeptic Research Center, CUPES-007, 2021. PDF. https://www.skeptic.com/research-center/reports/Research-Report-CUPES-007.pdf.
25 "Report Accuses News Media of Exaggerating Police Brutality." National Criminal Justice Association, August 11, 2023. https://www.ncja.org/crimeandjusticenews/report-accuses-news-media-of-exaggerating-police-brutality.
26 The Washington Post Staff. "Fatal Force: Police Shootings Database." *Washington Post*. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/investigations/police-shootings-database/.
27 Goldberg, Zach. "Perceptions Are Not Reality: What Americans Get Wrong About Police Violence." Manhattan Institute, August 10, 2023. https://manhattan.institute/article/perceptions-are-not-reality-what-americans-get-wrong-about-police-violence.
28 Fryer, Roland G., Jr. "An Empirical Analysis of Racial Differences in Police Use of Force." July 2017. PDF. https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/fryer/files/empirical_analysis_tables_figures.pdf.
29 Adams, Scott. *Reframe Your Brain: The User Interface for Happiness and Success*. Scott Adams, Inc., 2023.
30 Sailer, Steve. 2019. "The Democrats' Coalition of the Fringes is a circular firing squad …" Twitter, December 15, 2019, 7:39 PM. https://twitter.com/Steve_Sailer/status/1206373137765392385.
31 Fontanilla, Kali. "Nonprofits Fueling the Illegal Immigration Crisis." Capital Research Center, June 6, 2023. https://capitalresearch.org/article/nonprofits-fueling-the-illegal-immigration-crisis/.
32 Bensman, Todd. "Biden Admin. Sends Millions to Religious Nonprofits Facilitating Mass Illegal Migration." Center for Immigration Studies, January 30, 2024. https://cis.org/Bensman/Biden-Admin-Sends-Millions-Religious-Nonprofits-Facilitating-Mass-Illegal-Migration.
33 McCaughey, Betsy. "Government Using Charities to Hide Just How Much Money Is Going to Illegal Immigration." *New York Post*, July 22, 2022. https://nypost.com/2022/07/22/government-hides-money-for-illegal-immigration-in-charities/.
34 Ekins, Emily, and David Kemp. "Poll: 72% of Americans Say Immigrants Come to the United States for Jobs and to Improve Their Lives." Cato Institute, April 27, 2021. https://www.cato.org/blog/poll-72-americans-say-immigrants-come-us-jobs-improve-their-lives-53-say-ability-immigrate.
35 Ozimek, Tom. "Alarming Rise in Military-Aged Chinese Men Entering US Illegally, Border Patrol Union Chief Warns." *The Epoch Times*, February 20, 2024. https://www.myheraldreview.com/news/border/alarming-rise-in-military-aged-chinese-men-entering-us-illegally-border-patrol-union-chief-warns/article_00831fe0-d016–11ee-8f22–1fc3bc785d38.html.
36 Mordowanec, Nick. "Terrorists Using Fake IDs to Cross Border Raises Red Flags for FBI Director." *Newsweek*, March 12, 2024. https://www.newsweek.com/terrorists-using-fake-ids-cross-border-raises-red-flags-fbi-director-1878514.
37 Ruiz, Michael. "Palestinian Migrant Who Arrived via Mexico Allegedly Beat Homeowner over His Support for Israel: Video." Fox News, February 7, 2024. https://www.foxnews.com/us/palestinian-migrant-who-came-mexico-beat-homeowner-over-support-israel-video.
38 Lucas, Peter. "Lucas: Call It an Invasion." *Boston Herald*, February 26, 2024. https://www.bostonherald.com/2024/02/26/lucas-call-it-an-invasion/.
39 "NEW: SW Border Sector Chiefs Confirm Many Illegal Aliens Now Turn Themselves In amid Mayorkas' Catch-and-Release Policies." Homeland Security Committee, December 12, 2023. https://homeland.house.gov/2023/12/12/new-sw-border-sector-chiefs-confirm-many-illegal-aliens-now-turn-themselves-in-amid-mayorkas-catch-and-release-policies/.
40 @elonmusk (Elon Musk). "The far left US administration is using your tax dollars to fly violent criminals into America." Twitter, March 15 2024, 1:06 PM, https://twitter.com/elonmusk/status/1768685129088565355.
41 Lisec, Joshua. "I'm a Ghostwriter—Book Bans Are Beneficial." *Newsweek*. December 30, 2023.

https://www.newsweek.com/ghostwriter-book-bans-beneficial-1854414.

CHAPTER 3

1 Kuyers, Joshua. "Operational Preparation of the Environment: Intelligence Activity or Covert Action by Any Other Name?" *National Security Law Brief* 4, no. 1 (2013): 21–40. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1053&context=nslb.

2 Kenny, Michael T. *Leveraging Operational Preparation of the Environment in the GWOT*. Monograph. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, KS, School of Advanced Military Studies, 2006. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA450588

3 @Devon_Eriksen_ (Devon Eriksen). "Musk, here, thinks that the far left believe weakness makes righteousness. But that's not quite true …" Twitter, February 27, 2024, 9:23 AM, https://twitter.com/Devon_Eriksen_/status/1762483614711730607.

4 Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. February 1848. Written: Late 1847. First Published: February 1848. Translated by Samuel Moore in cooperation with Frederick Engels, 1888. Transcribed by Zodiac and Brian Baggins. Proofed and corrected against 1888 English Edition by Andy Blunden, 2004. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969. Marx/Engels Selected Works, Vol. One, pp. 98–137. Marxists Internet Archive, 1987, 2000, 2010. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf.

5 Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. "What Is To Be Done?" Conclusion. Marxists Internet Archive. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1901/witbd/concl.htm

6 Zitelmann, Rainer. "Anyone Who Doesn't Know the Following Facts About Capitalism Should Learn Them." *Forbes*, July 27, 2020. https://www.forbes.com/sites/rainerzitelmann/2020/07/27/anyone-who-doesnt-know-the-following-facts-about-capitalism-should-learn-them/?sh=a7c99763dc1e.

7 Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Manifesto of the Communist Party. February 1848. Written: Late 1847. First Published: February 1848. Translated by Samuel Moore in cooperation with Frederick Engels, 1888. Transcribed by Zodiac and Brian Baggins. Proofed and corrected against 1888 English Edition by Andy Blunden, 2004. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969. Marx/Engels Selected Works, Vol. One, pp. 98–137. Marxists Internet Archive, 1987, 2000, 2010. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf.

8 Rummel, R. J. *China's Bloody Century*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1991. Chapter 1, "Introduction and Overview." https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/CHINA.CHAP1.HTM#:~:text=In%20this%20they%20utterly%20failed,a%20prudent%2

9 Saich, Tony. *Finding Allies and Making Revolution: The Early Years of the Chinese Communist Party*. Boston: Brill, 2020. Available at https://brill.com/display/title/39022?language=en.

10 Trotsky, Leon. "Results and Prospects: X. The Struggle for Power." Transcribed and HTML markup for the Trotsky Internet Archive, a subarchive of the Marxists' Internet Archive, by Sally Ryan in 1996. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1931/tpr/rp10.htm.

11 Suny, Ronald Grigor. *The Revenge of the Past: Nationalism, Revolution, and the Collapse of the Soviet Union*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.

12 Pipes, Richard. *The Russian Revolution*. New York: Vintage, 1991.

13 Smith, S. A. *The Russian Revolution: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

14 Figes, Orlando. *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution: 1891–1924*. New York: Penguin Books, 1998.

15 Goldman, Wendy Z. *Women, the State and Revolution: Soviet Family Policy and Social Life, 1917–1936*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

16 Stites, Richard. *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism, and Bolshevism, 1860–1930*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

17 Kelly, Catriona. *Children's World: Growing Up in Russia, 1890–1991*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

18 Fitzpatrick, Sheila. *The Russian Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

19 Partido Comunista de España. *Evolución Histórica del PCE (I): De los Orígenes a la Lucha Guerrillera.* Madrid: Partido Comunista de España, Secretaría de Formación, julio 2012. https://2001–2018.pce.es/descarga/formacionpce1.pdf.

20 Kowalsky, Daniel. *Stalin and the Spanish Civil War*, Chapter 6. New York: Columbia University Press, January 22, 2004. Available at: http://www.gutenberg-e.org/kod01/print/kod10.pdf.

21 Saich, Tony. *Finding Allies and Making Revolution: The Early Years of the Chinese Communist Party*. Boston: Brill, 2020. Available at: https://brill.com/display/title/39022?language=en.

22 Kowalsky, Daniel. *Stalin and the Spanish Civil War*, Chapter 6. New York: Columbia University Press, January 22, 2004. Available at: http://www.gutenberg-e.org/kod01/print/kod10.pdf.

23 Ibid., Chapter 7. Available at: http://www.gutenberg-e.org/kod01/frames/fkod11.html.

CHAPTER 4

1 Dagger, Richard, and Terence Ball. "Communism." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, last modified March 11, 2024. Accessed April

10, 2024. https://www.britannica.com/topic/communism.
2 Paine, S. C. M., "26 Mao Zedong and Strategies of Nested War" In *The New Makers of Modern Strategy: From the Ancient World to the Digital Age* edited by Hal Brands, 638–662. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691226729–029.
3 Mao Tse-tung. "Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan." In *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, Vol. 1, pp. 23–59. Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1967. First Edition 1965, Second Printing 1967. Prepared for the Internet by David J. Romagnolo, May 1997. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/uprising1313/files/2017/09/Mao-Readings-Uprising-2–13.pdf.
4 Ibid.
5 Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. February 1848. Written: Late 1847. First Published: February 1848. Translated by Samuel Moore in cooperation with Frederick Engels, 1888. Transcribed by Zodiac and Brian Baggins. Proofed and corrected against 1888 English Edition by Andy Blunden, 2004. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969. Marx/Engels Selected Works, Vol. One, pp. 98–137. Marxists Internet Archive, 1987, 2000, 2010. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
14 Durant, Will, and Ariel Durant. *The Lessons of History*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968.
1 https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/enlightenment/
2 "The Long and Short Reasons for Why Revolution Broke Out in France in 1789," Swansea University, accessed April 13, 2024, https://www.swansea.ac.uk/history/history-study-guides/the-long-and-short-reasons-for-why-revolution-broke-out-in-france-in-1789/.
3 "Third Estate Makes Tennis Court Oath." History.com. Last modified June 20, 2019. https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/third-estate-makes-tennis-court-oath.
4 "Storming of the Bastille." New World Encyclopedia. Accessed April 13, 2024. https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Storming_of_the_Bastille.
5 "Did Marie Antoinette Really Say 'Let Them Eat Cake'?." History.com. Last modified April 16, 2019. https://www.history.com/news/did-marie-antoinette-really-say-let-them-eat-cake.
6 "The Jacobin dictatorship." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Accessed April 13, 2024. https://www.britannica.com/place/France/The-Jacobin-dictatorship.
7 Kiefer, James E. "Biographical Sketches of Memorable Christians of the Past: Louis XVI of France, King and Martyr." The Society of Archbishop Justus. Accessed April 11, 2024. http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bio/82.html.
8 "Synopsis: Dialogues of the Carmelites." San Francisco Opera. Accessed April 12, 2024. https://www.sfopera.com/operas/dialogues-of-the-carmelites/synopsis/.
9 Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Manifesto of the Communist Party. February 1848. Written: Late 1847. First Published: February 1848. Translated by Samuel Moore in cooperation with Frederick Engels, 1888. Transcribed by Zodiac and Brian Baggins. Proofed and corrected against 1888 English Edition by Andy Blunden, 2004. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969. Marx/Engels Selected Works, Vol. One, pp. 98–137. Marxists Internet Archive, 1987, 2000, 2010. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf.
10 Marx, Karl. "The Third Address: The Fall of Paris." In *The Civil War in France*, May 1871. English Edition of 1871. Transcribed and Markup by Zodiac & Brian Baggins. Proofed and corrected by Matthew Carmody, 2009. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1871/civil-war-france/ch06.htm.
11 Popkin, Jeremy D. *Facing Racial Revolution: Eyewitness Accounts of the Haitian Insurrection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007. Excerpt from pages 49–58. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/675831.html
12 Tickner, Arlene B., and David L. Blaney. *Claiming the International*. London: Routledge, 2013, 147.
13 Popkin, Jeremy D. *Facing Racial Revolution: Eyewitness Accounts of the Haitian Insurrection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007. Excerpt from pages 49–58. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/675831.html
14 The Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica. "Haitian Revolution." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, last modified March 28, 2024. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://www.britannica.com/topic/Haitian-Revolution.
15 The Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica. "Jean-Jacques Dessalines." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, last modified February 27, 2024. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Jean-Jacques-Dessalines
16 "Haiti Overview." World Bank, last updated October 26, 2023. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/haiti/overview.

17 Marshall, Esther. “The world’s happiest country named but Britons might be surprised about the UK.” Express.co.uk, March 9, 2024. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://www.express.co.uk/travel/articles/1875540/world-happiest-country-dominican-republic.
18 Farrag, Hebah. “The Fight for Black Lives is a Spiritual Movement.” Berkley Center for Religion, Peace & World Affairs, Georgetown University. June 9, 2020. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://berkleycenter.georgetown.edu/responses/the-fight-for-black-lives-is-a-spiritual-movement.

CHAPTER 6

1 Alekseev, V. V. “Yurovsky’s Account of the Execution of the Imperial Family.” In *The Last Act of a Tragedy: New Documents About the Execution of the Last Russian Emperor Nicholas II*, translated by Rob Moshein. Yekaterinburg: Urals Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, 1996. Published on Alexander Palace Time Machine. https://www.alexanderpalace.org/palace/yurovmurder.php.
2 Wrangel, Pyotr. *Always with Honor: The Memoirs of General Wrangel*. Translated by Sophie Goulston. Independently published, October 23, 2020.
3 “Internal Workings of the Soviet System.” Revelations from the Russian Archives, Library of Congress. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/intn.html.
4 Alekseev, V. V. “Yurovsky’s Account of the Execution of the Imperial Family.” In *The Last Act of a Tragedy: New Documents About the Execution of the Last Russian Emperor Nicholas II*, translated by Rob Moshein. Yekaterinburg: Urals Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences, 1996. Published on Alexander Palace Time Machine. https://www.alexanderpalace.org/palace/yurovmurder.php.
5 Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr I. *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918–1956: An Experiment in Literary Investigation*. Translated by Thomas P. Whitney and Harry Willetts. New York: Harper & Row, 1974–1978.
6 Ibid.
7 Wrangel, Pyotr. *Always with Honor: The Memoirs of General Wrangel*. Translated by Sophie Goulston. Independently published, October 23, 2020.
8 Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr I. *The Gulag Archipelago, 1918–1956: An Experiment in Literary Investigation*. Translated by Thomas P. Whitney and Harry Willetts. New York: Harper & Row, 1974–1978.

CHAPTER 7

1 Kaub, Verne P. *Communist-Socialist Propaganda in American Schools*. 4th ed. Boston, MA: Meador Publishing Company, 1958.
2 Carroll, Warren H. *The Last Crusade: Spain 1936*. Christendom Press, 1996. https://www.amazon.com/Last-Crusade-Spain-1936/dp/0931888670.
3 Beevor, Antony. *The Battle for Spain: The Spanish Civil War 1936–1939*. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.
4 Woolls, Daniel. “In the Spanish Civil War, Art as Torture.” *Washington Post*, April 1, 2003. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/2003/04/02/in-the-spanish-civil-war-art-as-torture/4372b9ef-bb6b-4b61-a85c-ab6f2d5d6140/.
5 “Declaration of Independence: A Transcription.” National Archives, https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript.
6 Cowans, Jon, ed. *Modern Spain: A Documentary History*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003, 177–179.
7 Kemp, Peter. *Mine Were of Trouble: A Nationalist Account of the Spanish Civil War*. Independently published, 2020.
8 Arnaud Imatz, “The Siege of the Alcazar: Myth And History,” The Postil Magazine, February 1, 2020, https://www.thepostil.com/the-siege-of-the-alcazar-myth-and-history/.

CHAPTER 8

1 Saich, Tony. *Finding Allies and Making Revolution: The Early Years of the Chinese Communist Party*. Boston: Brill, 2020. Available at: https://brill.com/display/title/39022?language=en.
2 Tung, Wei-Chen, and Zhizhong Li. “Pain Beliefs and Behaviors Among Chinese.” *Home Health Care Management & Practice* 27, no. 2 (2015): 95–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/1084822314547962.
3 von Hoffman, Nicholas. “Was McCarthy Right About the Left? The Reds Were Under the Bed While the Liberals Looked Away.” *Washington Post*, April 14, 1996.
4 U.S. Department of State. *Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers, Conferences at Malta and Yalta, 1945. Agreement Regarding Entry of the Soviet Union Into the War Against Japan*. Released to the press by the Department of State on February 11, 1946. Executive Agreement Series No. 498. Also in 59 Stat. 1823. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1946.
5 “Xian (Daoist Immortal).” New World Encyclopedia. https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Xian_(Daoist_immortal).

Accessed April 11, 2024.

6 Watson, Burton, trans. *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968, 122–123.

7 *3 Body Problem*. Episode 1, season 1. Featuring Jess Hong, Liam Cunningham, and Eiza González. Released 2024. Netflix, 61 min. https://www.netflix.com/title/81024821.

8 van der Made, Jan. "Cannibalism in China 50 years on." RFI, May 22, 2016. Last modified May 23, 2016. https://www.rfi.fr/en/asia-pacific/20160522-cannibalism-china-publication-official-records-50-years-after-cultural-revolut.

9 Reuters Fact Check. "Edmund Burke did not say evil triumphs when good men do nothing." Reuters, August 9, 2021. https://www.reuters.com/article/idUSL1N2PG1EY/.

CHAPTER 9

1 Biography.com, adapted by Newsela staff. "Martin Luther King Jr.'s Use of Nonviolence Inspired by Gandhi." Newsela, January 23, 2019. https://lincs.ed.gov/sites/default/files/TSTMCivEd-LsPln1stAmRgReadB-508.pdf.

2 "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action." Office of Planning and Research, United States Department of Labor, March 1965. www.dol.gov/asp/programs/history/webid-meynihan.htm.

3 Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. Manifesto of the Communist Party. February 1848. Written: Late 1847. First Published: February 1848. Translated by Samuel Moore in cooperation with Frederick Engels, 1888. Transcribed by Zodiac and Brian Baggins. Proofed and corrected against 1888 English Edition by Andy Blunden, 2004. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969. Marx/Engels Selected Works, Vol. One, 98–137. Marxists Internet Archive, 1987, 2000, 2010. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf.

4 Galatians 3:28–29 (NIV), in *The Holy Bible*, New International Version (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011).

5 Cloward, Richard A., and Frances Fox Piven. "The Weight of the Poor: A Strategy to End Poverty." *The Nation*, May 2, 1966. Reprint, CommonDreams.org, March 24, 2010. http://www.commondreams.org/headline/2010/03/24–4.

6 "Cloward–Piven strategy." Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cloward%E2%80%93Piven_strategy.

7 McWhorter, John. "Seduced: How Radical Ideas on Welfare, Work, and Family Sent Poor Black Americans to Hell." American Enterprise Institute, April 1, 2006. https://www.aei.org/articles/seduced-how-radical-ideas-on-welfare-work-and-family-sent-poor-black-americans-to-hell/.

8 McWhorter, John. "John McWhorter: How Welfare Went Wrong." Interview by Steve Inskeep. Morning Edition, NPR, August 9, 2006. Audio, 7:20. https://www.npr.org/2006/08/09/5628075/john-mcwhorter-how-welfare-went-wrong.

9 McCarthy, Joseph R. "'Communists in Government Service,' McCarthy Says." Speech, Wheeling, WV, February 9, 1950. United States Senate. https://www.senate.gov/about/powers-procedures/investigations/mccarthy-hearings/communists-in-government-service.htm.

10 Disney, Walter E. "Testimony of Walter E. Disney, Hearings Before the Committee on Un-American Activities." House of Representatives, 80th Congress, First Session, October 24, 1947. Quoted in "The Testimony of Walter E. Disney Before the House Committee on Un-American Activities (1947)." Encyclopedia.com. https://www.encyclopedia.com/defense/energy-government-and-defense-magazines/court-cases-speeches-and-testimony.

11 von Hoffman, Nicholas. "Was McCarthy Right About the Left? The Reds Were Under the Bed While the Liberals Looked Away." *Washington Post*, April 14, 1996. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/1996/04/14/was-mccarthy-right-about-the-left/a0dc6726-e2fd-4a31-bcdd-5f352acbf5de/.

12 Haynes, John Earl. "Cover Name, Cryptonym, Pseudonym, and Real Name Index: A Research Historian's Working Reference." Updated April 2009. https://www.johnearlhaynes.org/page66.html.

13 Bernstein, Andrew. "The Vindication of Joseph McCarthy." *The Objective Standard*, November 20, 2016. https://theobjectivestandard.com/2016/11/vindication-joseph-mccarthy/.

14 "Have You No Sense of Decency?" United States Senate, June 9, 1954. https://www.senate.gov/about/powers-procedures/investigations/mccarthy-hearings/have-you-no-sense-of-decency.htm.

15 Ibid.

16 McCarthy, Joseph R. "'Communists in Government Service,' McCarthy Says." Speech, Wheeling, WV, February 9, 1950. United States Senate. https://www.senate.gov/about/powers-procedures/investigations/mccarthy-hearings/communists-in-government-service.htm.

CHAPTER 10

1 Lengel, Ed. "The Greek Civil War, 1944–1949." The National WWII Museum, May 22, 2020. https://www.nationalww2museum.org/war/articles/greek-civil-war-1944–1949.

2 CBS News. "From the Archives: Fidel Castro's 1959 Interview on 'Face the Nation' after Seizing Power in Cuba." YouTube video. Posted January 1, 2023. https://youtu.be/QC0lYdqQ4wA?si=sg1Fqoe5pGnW3Jrc.

3 "Fidel Castro." Wikiquote. Last modified April 5, 2023. https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Fidel_Castro.

4 Vargas Llosa, Alvaro. "The Killing Machine." The Independent Institute, July 11, 2005.

https://www.independent.org/news/article.asp?id=1535.

5 Ibid.

6 Mitrokhin, Vasili, and Christopher Andrew. *The World Was Going Our Way: The KGB and the Battle for the Third World*. New York: Basic Books, 2005.

7 "The White Book of the Change of Government in Chile, September 11, 1973." Internet Archive. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://archive.org/details/bwb_O8-BSY-591/mode/2up. (Allegedly written by the CIA to explain and justify the military coup, this document shows evidence of election tampering by Allende.)

8 Packenham, Robert A., and William Ratliff. "What Pinochet Did for Chile." Hoover Digest, January 30, 2007. https://www.hoover.org/research/what-pinochet-did-chile.

9 "How General Pinochet's Detention Changed the Meaning of Justice." Amnesty International, October 16, 2013. https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2013/10/how-general-pinochets-detention-changed-meaning-justice/.

10 "General Pinochet." UK Parliament. House of Lords Hansard, July 6, 1999. https://hansard.parliament.uk/Lords/1999–07-06/debates/4d1389e5-d04f-4799–9b26–63cf16122693/GeneralPinochet.

11 "Cambodia." Holocaust and Genocide Studies, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://cla.umn.edu/chgs/holocaust-genocide-education/resource-guides/cambodia#:~:text=Because%20the%20Khmer%20Rouge%20placed,Pol%20Pot's%20reign%20of%20terror..

12 Pot, Pol. "Speech made by Pol Pot, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kampuchea, Prime Minister of the Government of Democratic Kampuchea, on the occasion of the 17th anniversary of the Communist Party of Kampuchea, 27 September, 1977." Unofficial translation prepared by Group of Kampuchean Residents in America. Marxists Internet Archive. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://www.marxists.org/archive/pol-pot/1977/cpk-17th-aniv.pdf.

13 Becker, Elizabeth. *When The War Was Over: Cambodia And The Khmer Rouge Revolution*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2015. Kindle edition, 63.

14 Ibid., 6.

15 Ibid., 103.

16 Ibid., 15–16.

17 Ibid., 16–17.

18 Ibid., 16–17.

19 McQueen, Megan. "The Cambodian Genocide, 1975–1979 (Ben Kiernan, 2004)." Modern Southeast Asia, Yale University. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://seasia.yale.edu/cambodian-genocide-1975–1979-ben-kiernan-2004.

20 Ngor, Haing. *Survival in the Killing Fields*. London: Little, Brown Book Group, 2012. Kindle edition, 169.

21 Ibid.

22 Somoza, Anastasio, as told to Jack Cox. *Nicaragua Betrayed*. Boston and Los Angeles: Western Islands Press, 1980.

23 Merrill, Tim, ed. *Nicaragua: A Country Study*. Pg. 72. Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress, 1995.

24 Ibid., 35.

25 De Borchgrave, Arnaud. "Soviet Disinformation." January 1985. Declassified in part and sanitized copy approved for release January 20, 2012. PDF file. Central Intelligence Agency. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP90–00965R000201460021–9.pdf.

26 Carter, Jimmy. "Inaugural Address of President Jimmy Carter." Jimmy Carter Library. January 20, 1977. Accessed April 18th, 2024. https://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/the-carters/selected-speeches/inaugural-address-of-president-jimmy-carter.

27 Somoza, Anastasio, as told to Jack Cox. *Nicaragua Betrayed*. 24–25. Boston and Los Angeles: Western Islands Press, 1980.

28 Ibid., 297.

29 Ibid., 295–296.

30 Ibid., 394

31 The Heritage Foundation. "The Sandinista War on Human Rights." The Backgrounder, no. 277, The Heritage Foundation (July 19, 1983): 1–12. Accessed April 19, 2024. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP85M00363R000300630015–8.pdf.

32 Ibid.

33 Ibarz, Joaquin. "Piñata Theology: The Sandinistas' Preferential Option for the Rich." *Crisis Magazine*, September 1, 1991. First published in *La Jornada*, May 12, 1991. Translated by Timothy Goodman. Accessed April 18th, 2024. https://crisismagazine.com/vault/pinata-theology-the-sandinistas-preferential-option-for-the-rich..

34 Ibid.

35 "International Poll: No Consensus on Who Was Behind 9/11." World Public Opinion. September 10, 2008. http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/international_security_bt/535.php.

36 Rashid, Ahmed. *Taliban: Militant Islam, Oil and Fundamentalism in Central Asia*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010. 129.

37 Westad, Odd Arne. "Reagan's Anti-Revolutionary Offensive in the Third World." *In The Last Decade of the Cold War: From Conflict Escalation to Conflict Transformation*, edited by Olav Njølstad, 206–234. London: Routledge, 2004.

38 Dupree, Louis. *Afghanistan*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980.

39 Braithwaite, Rodric. *Afgantsy: The Russians in Afghanistan, 1979–1989*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

40 Crile, George. *Charlie Wilson's War*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2003.
41 Coll, Steve. *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.

CHAPTER 11

1 Meredith, Martin. *The Fate of Africa: A History of the Continent Since Independence*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2011.
2 Chung, Fay. *Re-living the Second Chimurenga: Memories from the Liberation Struggle in Zimbabwe*. Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute, 2006.
3 "On This Day: Rhodesian Whites Approve New Constitution." BBC News, January 30, 1979. http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/january/30/newsid_2452000/2452181.stm.
4 Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace in Zimbabwe. "Breaking the Silence, Building True Peace: A Report on the Disturbances in Matabeleland and the Midlands 1980 to 1988." Harare: Legal Resources Foundation, 1997.
5 Hill, Geoff. *What Happens After Mugabe?: Can Zimbabwe Rise from the Ashes?* Cape Town: Zebra Press, 2005.
6 Marongwe, Nelson. "Redistributive Land Reform and Poverty Reduction in Zimbabwe." Working paper for the research project on "Livelihoods after Land Reform." Accessed April 11, 2024. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08ae4ed915d622C000985/60332_Zimbabwe_Land_Reform.pdf.
7 Godwin, Peter. *The Fear: Robert Mugabe and the Martyrdom of Zimbabwe*. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2010.
8 "Zimbabwe: Events of 2023." In World Report 2024. Human Rights Watch. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2024/country-chapters/zimbabwe.
9 Windrem, Robert. "US Government Considered Nelson Mandela a Terrorist Until 2008." NBC News, December 7, 2013. https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/us-government-considered-nelson-mandela-terrorist-until-2008-flna2d11708787.
10 Thompson, Leonard. *A History of South Africa*. 3rd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
11 Mandela, Nelson. *Long Walk to Freedom*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1994.
12 Biko, Steve. *I Write What I Like*. Edited by Aelred Stubbs. London: Bowerdean Press, 1978.
13 Barrell, Howard. *MK: The ANC's Armed Struggle*. London: Penguin Books, 1990.
14 Sparks, Allister. *Tomorrow is Another Country: The Inside Story of South Africa's Road to Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
15 Adepitan, Ade. "Ade Adepitan: 'I Went to the Whitest Place on Earth —and Saw a Global Shift to the Far-Right'." *The Telegraph*, March 18, 2024. https://www.telegraph.co.uk/tv/2024/03/18/ade-adepitan-orania-south-africa-whites-only-channel-4/.
16 "Bottle-feeding This Young Baby Monster Juju." Sowetan Live, March 8, 2010. http://www.sowetanlive.co.za/sowetan/archive/2010/03/08/bottle-feeding-this-young-baby-monster-juju.
17 "South Africa's Malema Cleared of Hate Speech." Reuters, April 20, 2010. https://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE63J2JM20100420.
18 McKenna, Amy. "Julius Malema." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Last modified April 11, 2024. https://www.britannica.com/biography/Julius-Malema.
19 "Trump's Warning of a 'Blood Bath' if He Loses." *New York Times*, March 18, 2024. https://www.nytimes.com/2024/03/18/opinion/donald-trump-blood-bath.html.
20 New York Times World (@nytimesworld). "When a Black South African political leader chanted 'kill the Boer,' referring to white farmers, some far-right commentators said he was advocating white genocide. But that's not the meaning of the chant, analysts say." Twitter, August 2, 2023, 11:49 PM. https://twitter.com/nytimesworld/status/1686947268870447104.

CHAPTER 12

1 Taibbi, Matt. "Capsule Summaries of All Twitter Files Threads to Date, With Links and a Glossary." Racket, January 4, 2023. https://www.racket.news/p/capsule-summaries-of-all-twitter.
2 "Satisfaction With the United States." Gallup. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://news.gallup.com/poll/1669/general-mood-country.aspx.
3 Forward Defense experts. "Today's Wars Are Fought in the 'Gray Zone.' Here's Everything You Need to Know About It." New Atlanticist (blog), Atlantic Council, February 23, 2022. https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/todays-wars-are-fought-in-the-gray-zone-heres-everything-you-need-to-know-about-it/.
4 "Rule of Law in the Gray Zone." Modern War Institute at West Point. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://mwi.westpoint.edu/rule-law-gray-zone/.
5 "Rule 1. The Principle of Distinction between Civilians and Combatants." International Humanitarian Law Databases, International Committee of the Red Cross. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/customary-ihl/v1/rule1.
6 Picket, Kerry. "Whistleblower Testimony to Shed Light on National Guard's Delayed Response to Jan. 6 Riot at Capitol." *Washington Times*. April 15, 2024. https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2024/apr/15/whistleblowers-to-testify-about-

national-guards-de/.

7 Becker, Kyle (@kylenabecker). "National Guard Captain Blows Up J6 Narrative, Accuses U.S. Govt of Lying to the American People." Twitter, April 17, 2024, 9:41 PM. https://twitter.com/kylenabecker/status/1780773564997644341.

8 Kamisar, Ben. "Almost a Third of Americans Still Believe 2020 Election Result Was Fraudulent." NBC News, June 20, 2023. https://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meetthepressblog/almost-third-americans-still-believe-2020-election-result-was-fraudule-rcna90145.

9 Murray, Mark. "Poll: 61% of Republicans Still Believe Biden Didn't Win Fair and Square in 2020." NBC News, September 27, 2022. https://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meetthepressblog/poll-61-republicans-still-believe-biden-didnt-win-fair-square-2020-rcna49630.

10 Rasmussen Poll (@Rasmussen_Poll). "The Fake News Election Fraud Dodge." Twitter, April 14, 2024, 7:12 AM. https://twitter.com/Rasmussen_Poll/status/1779467886622277975.

11 Austin-Hillery, Nicole, and Victoria Strang. "Racism's Prominent Role in January 6 US Capitol Attack." Human Rights Watch, January 5, 2022. https://www.hrw.org/news/2022/01/05/racisms-prominent-role-january-6-us-capitol-attack.

12 "US: Impeachment Not Enough." Human Rights Watch, February 8, 2021. https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/02/08/us-impeachment-not-enough.

13 Robb, John. "Weaponized Social Networks." Global Guerillas (blog), June 30, 2022. https://johnrobb.substack.com/p/weaponized-social-networks.

14 Wall, Travis, and Teodor Mitew. "Swarm Networks and the Design Process of a Distributed Meme Warfare Campaign." First Monday 22, no. 5 (May 7, 2018). https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v23i5.8290.

15 Krysinska, Karolina, and David Lester. "Suicide in the Soviet Gulag Camps." Archives of Suicide Research 12, no. 2 (2008): 170–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/13811110701857541.

16 Crittenden, John A. *Parties and Elections in the United States*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982. Quoted in "Statement during the Civil War," *Time*, 1938.

17 DiIulio, John J., Jr. "My Black Crime Problem, and Ours." *City Journal*, Spring 1996. https://www.city-journal.org/html/my-black-crime-problem-and-ours-11773.html.

18 Currie, Elliott. "America's Refusal to Address the Roots of Violence." Review of *A Peculiar Indifference: The Neglected Toll of Violence on Black America*, by Elliott Currie. *New York Times*, October 5, 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/05/books/review/a-peculiar-indifference-elliott-currie.html.

19 Musk, Elon (@elonmusk). "Most reasonable people, because they are reasonable, cannot believe that the goal of the far left is to end America." Twitter, March 19, 2024, 3:32 PM. https://twitter.com/elonmusk/status/1770171578736627997.

20 Roth, Martha T. *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1995. Archived from the original on October 5, 2022. Retrieved February 18, 2021. https://web.archive.org/web/20221005000000*/https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/pubs/061045P.pdf.

21 "Atomic Diplomacy." Office of the Historian, Foreign Service Institute, United States Department of State. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945–1952/atomic.

CHAPTER 13

1 "Professor Watchlist." Turning Point USA. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://professorwatchlist.org/.

2 "National Public Radio (NPR)." Influence Watch. Accessed April 11, 2024. https://influencewatch.org/non-profit/national-public-radio-npr.

3 Ziady, Hanna. "Bud Light Boycott Likely Cost Anheuser-Busch InBev over $1 Billion in Lost Sales." CNN Business, February 29, 2024. https://www.cnn.com/2024/02/29/business/bud-light-boycott-ab-inbev-sales/index.html.

4 Morgan, Kyle, and Richard Laycock. "Student Loan Debt Statistics." Finder, March 8, 2024. https://www.finder.com/student-loans/student-loan-debt-statistics.

5 "Endowments." Fast Facts, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Accessed April 11, 2024. https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=73.

6 Miller, Geoffrey (@primalpoly). "The real way to 'make college more affordable' …" Twitter, March 30, 2024, 4:20 PM. https://twitter.com/primalpoly/status/1774169880222110077.

7 Wokal Distance (@wokal_distance). "Left Wing Billionaires think like great men of history …" Twitter, March 20, 2024, 10:09 PM. https://twitter.com/wokal_distance/status/1770633898122502146.

8 Stonetoss Comics (@stone_toss). "The Flurk plushie sale was so popular …" Twitter, March 23, 2024, 12:31 p.m. https://twitter.com/stone_toss/status/1771575505235382408?s=03.

9 Cowans, Jon, ed. *Modern Spain: A Documentary History*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003, 211–214.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Every book has a backstory. We would like to thank a few special people behind this one. Thank you to Blake Neff, Jack Posobiec's cohost for the *Human Events Daily* series *Chronicles of the Revolution* that initially inspired this book. And thank you Angelo Fazio and Russ Spacy, the series producers for that as well as *The China Files*. And finally, thank you, Cynthia Yockey: You supported this project with thorough research; your work was indispensable and invaluable.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Jack Posobiec is senior editor at Human Events and host of *Human Events Daily*, which has more than 250 million downloads. He is a veteran U.S. Navy intelligence officer with deployments to Guantanamo Bay and East Asia. Posobiec's final deployment was as intelligence director for Navy Expeditionary Forces Command Pacific—Task Force 75. Posobiec has authored three books: *Citizens for Trump: The Inside Story of the People's Movement to Take Back America*, *4D Warfare: A Doctrine for a New Era of Political Warfare*, and *The Antifa: Stories from Inside the Black Bloc*. In 2019, Posobiec was awarded a Lincoln Fellowship by the Claremont Institute. A Temple University—Philadelphia, graduate, Posobiec lived in China before settling in Washington, DC, with his wife and two sons.

Joshua Lisec writes books of consequence. He is a *Wall Street Journal* bestselling ghostwriter with more than eighty books ghostwritten that have been translated into a dozen languages. Lisec is best known for his literary collaborations with controversial public figures, capturing their authentic voice and conveying the whole story. Lisec is also the author of the bestselling irreverent guide to entrepreneurship *So Good They Call You a Fake* and creator of *The Best Way to Say It*® writing programs. In 2021, he was executive producer of *Better Left Unsaid*, an award-winning documentary exposing the suppressed history of communist uprisings. Joshua has been featured in *Publishers Weekly*, *Newsweek*, *Forbes*, BBC, TEDx, Sky News, and TMZ, among others. Joshua lives with his wife and children near Dayton, Ohio.

INDEX

1984 (Orwell), 104, 115

A

Adams, Scott, 18, 23, 200
Afghan-Soviet War, 179–180
African National Congress (ANC), 185–186
Albert Kahn Associates, 127
Alexander III of Russia, 87
Alexander II of Russia, 85
Allende, Salvador, 163–165
Always with Honor (Wrangel), 100–101
American Revolution, 62, 65–66, 109
anarcho-tyranny, 11–12, 15, 20, 199, 218, 228
ANC. *See* African National Congress (ANC)
Antifa, 93, 214
APLA. *See* Azanian People's Liberation Army (APLA)
Aristotle, 11
Art of War, The (Sun Tzu), 25
asymmetric information, 27
Atlantic Council, 192
Aylwin, Patricio, 164
Azaña, Manuel, 43, 104
Azanian People's Liberation Army (APLA), 186

B

Babbitt, Ashli, 196
Batista, Fulgencio, 159–160
Battle for Spain, The: The Spanish Civil War 1936—1939 (Beevor), 107
Beevor, Antony, 107
Biden, Joe, 194, 226
Biko, Steve, 186
Black Consciousness Movement, 186
Black Lives Matter, 80, 214
Black Panthers, 144–145
Blank Slate Theory, 69
Bolsheviks, 9, 30, 36–37, 41, 87–89, 93, 97
Bonfire of the Vanities, The (Wolfe), 150
Boukman, Dutty, 75
Boxer Rebellion, 34, 120
Brown, Archie, 35
Brown, Michael, 17
Brown v. Board of Education, 147
Brusilov, Aleksei, 88
Burke, Edmund, 135

C

Caesar, Julius, 47, 51, 58–59, 210–211
Cambodia, 166–172
cancel culture, 23
Capitol Hill Autonomous Zone (CHAZ) (Seattle), 14–15
Carroll, Warren, 105
Carter, Jimmy, 174–175, 178
Castro, Fidel, 160–161
Catholic Church, 63, 67, 73, 80, 106, 108
CCP. *See* Chinese Communist Party (CCP)
Cernovich, Mike, 114
Chamorro, Violeta Barrios de, 177–178
Chauvin, Derek, 13–14, 17
CHAZ. *See* Capitol Hill Autonomous Zone (CHAZ) (Seattle)
Chesterton, A. G. K., 113
Chiang Kai-shek, 39, 43, 119, 122–123, 125, 136, 156, 210
Chile, 163–166
China, 21, 33–35, 39–40, 43, 49, 53–55, 81, 119–136, 168, 182
Chinese Communist Party (CCP), 34–35, 39–40, 43–44, 121–122, 124–125, 128
Churchill, Winston, 127
citizenship, 11
Ciutah, Angel, 162
Civil Rights Act of 1964, 142–143
Civil Rights Movement, 137–156
Civil War in France, The (Marx), 74
clergy, 31–32
Cloward-Piven Strategy, 151–152
Cold War, 57–58, 157, 186, 205
Collins, Michael, 66
Communist International (Comintern), 32, 34–35, 37–38, 42–43, 93, 106, 109
Communist Manifesto, The (Marx), 29, 31, 48, 53, 55–56, 73–74, 85, 141
Communist Party USA, 3–4
contraception, 146
Coplin, Judith, 155
Crime and Punishment (Dostoevsky), 83
Cuban Missile Crisis, 162–163
Cuban Revolution, 159–163
Cullors, Patriss, 80
Cultural Marxism, 7, 120, 137–156, 182, 184–185, 187, 193–194, 196, 198, 212–213, 215, 228
Cultural Revolution (China), 54–55, 113, 133–136
culture, shared, 10–11
Cummings, Scott, 139–140

D

Dartmouth College, 144–145
deaths, from communism, 9, 34, 81, 102, 118, 136, 156, 180, 188
Declaration of Independence, 144
DEI. *See* Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)
de Klerk, F. W., 186
dekulakization, 90–94
Deng Xiaoping, 133, 135
desecration, 68
desegregation, 147
Dessalines, Jean-Jacques, 77–78
Disney, Walt, 153–154, 156
"disparate impact," 142–143
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI), 80, 214
Dominican Republic, 75, 78
Dosotevsky, Fyodor, 83

Durant, Ariel, 56
Durant, Will, 56
Duranty, Walter, 97
Durkan, Jenny, 15

E

Easter Rising, 66
Edgeworth, Henry, 70
Engels, Frederik, 51, 53, 55, 74, 190
English Civil War, 66
Enlightenment, 62, 68, 72
equality, 10, 27–28, 48, 79–81, 142, 151–152, 183–184
Estats-General, in France, 63–64

F

facts, feelings *vs.,* 19–23, 80
fairness, 10, 12
feelings, facts *vs.,* 19–23, 80
feminism, 146
Finding Allies and Making Revolution (Saitch), 39
Floyd, George, 13–14, 16–18, 150, 152
For Whom the Bell Tolls (Hemingway), 104
Founding Fathers, 10, 61–62, 65, 109, 138
France, 38
Franco, Francisco, 42, 58, 101, 103–104, 107, 109–116, 174, 202, 210, 228
Franklin, Benjamin, 61, 110
freedom, 10–11, 36–37, 116–118
French Revolution, 1, 61–81
Friedman, Milton, 164

G

Gaddis, John Lewis, 127
Gay, Claudine, 214
George V of Great Britain, 86
Gold, Harry, 155
Goldman, Emma, 114
Gorbachev, Mikhail, 180
gray zone warfare, 192–194
Great Depression, 57
Great Leap Forward, 113, 130–133
Greece, 57, 158
Grossman, Dave, 183
Guevara, Che, 160–163
Gulag Archipelago, The (Solzhenitsyn), 12, 97–98

H

Haiti, 74–79
Hayek, Friedrich, 164
Haynes, John Earl, 155
Hemingway, Ernest, 104
Hispanic, 148–149
Hiss, Alger, 155
History of the Peloponnesian War (Thucydides), 35
Holodomor, 92–93
Homage to Catalonia (Orwell), 104, 111, 115
Hong Kong, 120
House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), 153–154

HUAC. *See* House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC)
Hundred Flowers Campaign, 129–130

I

Ifá, 80
immigration, 11–12, 21–22
incitation, 52, 56, 89
income inequality, 48–49
Industrial Revolution, 29
Infiltration Stage, 40–44, 227–228
insurrection, 43, 73–74, 195–196
International Women's Day, 37
Ireland, 66
Iron Law of Exact Reciprocity, 204–206, 212–213
irregular revolution, 120, 197–198, 201, 208, 217
irregular warfare, 6, 197, 199, 208

J

Jacobins, 67–69, 81
January 6, 194–197
Japan, 123–124
Jefferson, Thomas, 61, 109
Johnson, Lyndon, 142
June Days Uprising, 73

K

Katyn Massacre, 91
Kaub, Vere P., 103
Kemp, Peter, 115–118
Kennan, George F., 57–58, 74, 158, 209
Kennan Containment Theory, 158
Kennedy, John F., 162
Kennedy, Robert F., Sr., 153
KGB, 161
Khan, Mohammed Daoud, 179
Khmer Rouge, 169–172
Khrushchev, Nikita, 162–163
Kiernan, Ben, 171
King, Martin Luther, Jr., 138–142
Kingdom of God Is Within You, The (Tolstoy), 30
Kolakowski, Leszek, 81
Korean War, 159
Kowalski, David, 190
kulaks, 90–94

L

La Asociación de Amigos de la Unión Soviética, 38
Laotian Civil War, 189
Last Crusade, The: Spain 1936 (Carroll), 105
lawfare, 3, 6, 142–143, 194–195, 212, 214, 219
Leffler, Melvyn, 127
Left behind in Rosedale (Cummings), 140
Leiken, Robert S., 173–174
Lend-Lease Act, 127
Lenin, Vladimir, 8–9, 12, 31, 36–39, 55, 87, 89–90, 99, 101
Lessons of History, The (Durant and Durant), 56
Lin Biao, 135

lists, 213
Liu Shaoqi, 133
Louis XVI of France, 63–66, 68–70, 73, 81, 85, 88, 110, 211
Louverture, Toussaint, 77

M

Main Currents of Marxism, The (Kolakowski), 81
Malema, Julius, 187–188
Manchuria, 123, 127–128
Mandela, Nelson, 181, 185–186
Mao Zedong, 35, 49–50, 53, 81, 121–135, 189
Marat, Jean-Paul, 61
Marshall, George, 125–126
Marshall Plan, 158
Marx, Karl, 8–9, 35, 51, 53, 55, 74, 190
Marxism, 31, 35, 111. *See also* Cultural Marxism
Marxist Study Societies, 39
McCarthy, Joseph, 125–126, 153, 156, 211
McCarthy, Ryan, 196
McWhorter, John, 151–152
Mearsheimer, John, 127
media, 10
Mensheviks, 30–31, 37, 52
Messaging Stage, 35–40, 225–227
microrevolutions, 197–204
migration, 10–11
Miller, Chris, 196
Miller, Geoffrey, 220
Mine Were of Trouble (Kemp), 115–118
MK. *See* Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK)
Mongolia, 189
Montesquieu, 62
Moscardó, José, 116–117
Moscardó, Luis, 116–117
Moynihan Report, 140–141
Mugabe, Robert, 182–185
Musk, Elon, 22, 204, 211, 213, 221

N

Nagasaki, 127
Napoleon, 73, 77, 210
National Tax Transparency Act, 215–216
Neff, Blake, 104
NEPmen, 91–92
Newark, New Jersey, 139–140
Ngor, Haing, 171
Nicaragua, 173–178
Nicholas II of Russia, 30–31, 37, 41–42, 85–86, 90
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 10
Nkomo, Joshua, 182
NKVD. *See* People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD)
noblesse, oblige, 217–218
Nol, Lon, 168, 171

O

Obama, Barack, 181
Occupy Wall Street, 15
Ogé, Vincent, 75

O'Keefe, James, 213–214
OPE. *See* Operational Preparation of the Environment (OPE)
Operational Preparation of the Environment (OPE), 26–44, 190, 199, 224–228
Operation Cyclone, 180
Opium Wars, 33, 120
Oppenheimer, Robert, 155–156
Ortega, Daniel, 178
Ortega, Humberto, 178
Orthodox Church, 93
Orwell, George, 104, 111, 115
Ouroboros, 57, 94–96, 208–210

P

Paris Commune, 74, 130
Parks, Rosa, 138
Patterson, John H., 218
PDPA. *See* People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA)
People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD), 91, 96
People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA), 179–180
Perlo, Victor, 155
Peter the Great, 61–62
Pinochet, Augusto, 164–166, 174
police violence, 13–14, 16–18
Pol-Pot, 166–172
Potsdam, 127
POUM. *See* Workers' Party of Marxist Unification (POUM)
Primo de Rivera, Miguel, 38
propaganda, 19–20, 36, 38–41, 43, 114, 143, 173, 190, 212–213, 224
Protestant Reformation, 63
Prussia, 70, 74
purge, 54–56, 104–105

R

radicalism, 51, 146–147, 152
Raichik, Chaya, 214
rape, 106
Reagan, Ronald, 178
reciprocity, 204–206, 212–213
Red Guards, 134–135, 212
Red Scare, 153–154
Reformation, 63
Reign of Terror, 71–72
religion, 31–32
Rhodes, Cecil, 181
Rhodesia, 181–185
Riley, Laken, 202
Rise and Fall of Communism, The (Brown), 35
Robespierre, Maximilien, 1, 71–72
Rojos, 107, 109–110, 113, 115–117
Rome, 47–51
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 126–127
Rosenberg, Ethel, 155
Rosenberg, Julius, 155
Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 62
Rufo, Christopher, 213–214
Russia, 8–9, 29–30, 36–37, 41, 87
Russian Civil War, 89–90
Russian Revolution, 30–31, 37–38, 41–42, 83–94, 97–102

Russo-Chinese Information Bureau, 43
Russo-Japanese War, 37

S

Sailer, Steve, 21
Saitch, Tony, 39
Sandinistas, 73, 174–175, 177–178
Sandmann, Nick, 18–19
Santayana, George, 3
Saur Revolution, 179
Seattle, Washington, 14–15
seize, 52–54, 56
self-defense, 12
self-empowerment, 31
Separation Stage, 29–35, 224–225
September 11 attacks, 179
Seven Years' War, 62
sexual revolution, 146
sexual violence, 106
Shanghai, 120
Shanghai Massacre, 122
Short, Philip, 130
Sihanouk, Norodom, 168–169, 172
Sisulu, Walter, 185–186
Slovo, Joe, 186
Socialist Youth Corps, 39
Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr, 12, 97–98, 101
Somoza Debayle, Anastasio, 173–178
South Africa, 181–182, 184, 186–188, 246n20
Soviet Union, 8–9, 35, 40, 43, 57–58, 91–92, 110, 121, 129, 154–155, 158–159, 161, 179–180, 182
Soweto Uprising, 186
Spain, 31–33, 37–39, 42–43
Spanish Civil War, 43, 49, 101, 103–118
Stalin, Joseph, 12, 91, 99, 127
Stalin and the Spanish Civil War (Kowalski), 190
Stolypin, Pyotr, 85
St. Petersburg, 85–89
Straw, Jack, 166
student loan debt, 219–220
subversion, 156, 173, 184, 195, 213
Sullivan, Ed, 160
Sun Tzu, 25
Sun Yat-sen, 39, 43, 120–122

T

Taft, Robert, 127, 155
Taiping Rebellion, 33
Tambo, Oliver, 186
Tennis Court Oath, 64
terror, 1, 50
terrorism, 12
Thatcher, Margaret, 165–166
Thucydides, 35
Tiananmen Square Massacre, 59, 135
Tolstoy, Leo, 30
Trotsky, Leon, 36, 38–39, 111
Truman, Harry, 126
Truman Doctrine, 158

Trump, Donald, 18–19, 79, 182, 188, 194–197, 226
"two movies on one screen" phenomenon, 18

U

Ukraine, 92–93
Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK), 186

V

values, shared, 10–11
Venona Intercepts, 127, 154–155
Vietnam War, 159, 168
Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de, 7

W

Wallace, William Ross, 39
Weather Underground, 141–142
Wedemeyer, Albert, 126
What Is to Be Done? (Lenin), 31
White Army, 30, 89–90, 94–95, 98–101
white nationalism, 18–19
white supremacy, 80
Wilson, Charlie, 180
Wilson, Darren, 17
Wilson, Woodrow, 101
Wolfe, Thomas, 150
Workers' Party of Marxist Unification (POUM), 111
World War I, 86, 89
World War II, 91, 93, 103, 110, 113, 123–124, 127, 157
Wrangel, Pyotr, 58, 88–90, 97–102, 125, 156, 207, 209–210, 221–222

Y

Yuan Shikai, 121
Yurovsky, Yakov, 83–85, 94–96

Z

Zhang Xueliang, 123–124
Zimbabwe, 181–185
Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), 182–183
Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU), 182–183
Zuma, Jacob, 187–188